DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 860 SP 002 722

A Pride of Lions. America's Cultural Communities and the Preparation of Teachers.

Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Tri-University Project in Elementary Education.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Tri-University Project in Elementary Education.

Pub Date 68

Note-375p.; Fourth National Conference, The U.S. Office of Education Tri-University Project in Elementary Education, Sept. 19-20, 1968, Minneapolis.

EDRS Price MF-$1.50 HC-$18.85

Descriptors-Behavioral Sciences, Black Community, *Community Influence, *Educational Change, *Elementary Education, English Literature, Migrant Workers, Navaho, Political Power, Rural Education, Social Sciences, *Teacher Education

Identifiers-Appalachia, Tri-University Project in Elementary Education

During this two-day conference in 1968, 12 community representatives (black, Navajo, Appalachian, and migrant farm worker), who had had experience with trying to influence school policy and teacher training, confronted elementary teachers, teacher educators, and representatives from the U.S. Office of Education. The theme of many speeches is power--the power structure of educational systems, the power of communities to influence what and how teachers teach (and hence how teachers are educated). The first three speeches presented in the document, given by a school superintendent, an American Historical Association member, and a school of education dean, discuss the "power realities" of the school system, colonialism and paternalism in higher education, and the responsibilities of schools of education. A second cluster of speeches by community representatives focuses on conditions in "powerless" communities--obstacles to educational improvement, improvements already made (such as the Rough Rock Demonstration School), and present goals. The third cluster of speeches contains suggestions by three Tri-University participants for change in teaching and teacher education in behavioral science, social science, and English. Each speech is followed by group reactions. The conference report concludes with a response from a representative of the Office of Education and an account of the participants' attempt to vote on resolutions submitted by community representatives. ED 024 618, ED 025 450, and ED 025 461 are related documents. (LP)

ED029860

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A PRIDE OF LIONS

America's Cultural Communities and the Preparation of Teachers

The U. S. Office of Education Tri-University Project
in Elementary Education
September 19 & 20, 1968
Minneapolis, Minnesota

SP002722

. . . . I declare
They shall inherit my pride,
The pride of people that were
Bound neither to Cause nor to State,
Neither to slaves that were spat on,
Nor to the tyrants that spat, ...
Pride, like that of the morn,
When the headlong light is loose,
Or that of the fabulous horn,
Or that of the sudden shower
When all streams are dry. . . .

W. B. Yeats,
Irish Community Leader

If you remember a few years ago, James Lloyd was in New York. I've never met him, but I read one statement that he made after he was finally fired. He said, "If only for once a herd of sheep would act like a pride of lions."

Armin Beck

Pride: 1b. a reasonable or justifiable self-respect;
5. a company of lions.

Webster's Seventh Collegiate
Dictionary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction, Paul A. Olson 1

I

MUTUAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE TRAINING OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

Slow Dance on the Killing Ground: Public Schools, Publics, Teachers and Children
Mr. Dick Foster 33

Response to Dick Foster: I Speak in Parables: Your Child is a Reproach
Mr. Ernest Chambers 47

Group Discussion: The Omaha Black Community
Mr. Ernest Chambers 61

Colonialism and Paternalism in the Disciplines -- American Higher Education and American Children
Mr. Paul Ward 99

Professional Competence, the American Community and the Responsibility of the School of Education
Dean Daniel E. Griffiths 113

Remarks
Representative Ernest Morial and
Dean Daniel E. Griffiths 127

Group Discussion: The South
Representative Ernest Morial 132

II

FOUR AMERICAN COMMUNITIES: HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE SCHOOLS

The Navajo Community

Mr. John Dick 147
Mrs. Alice Neundorf 152
Mr. Robert Norris 158
Group Discussion 164

A Farm Workers' Community
Mr. Jim Drake 180
Group Discussion 186

Appalachia
Miss Sue Easterling 207
Mrs. Zi Graves. 212
Group Discussion 218

Woodlawn, Chicago
Mr. Anthony Gibbs 239
Mrs. Louise Bufford. 246
Group Discussion: Woodlawn 252
Mr. Armin Beck 281
Group Discussion: Center for Inner City Studies . . 286

III

THE TRI-UNIVERSITY PROJECT'S ANSWERS AND AMERICA'S CHILDREN

It's Time to Pay Off Hell: The Challenge, Change and Children
Mr. Mel Ezer 306

Reform in Education Today
Mr. James L. Hills 320

The Profession of English and the Training of Elementary Teachers: A Case of Neglect
Mr. William Anderson 330

IV

A RESPONSE FROM A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

We Have Met the Enemy
Associate Commissioner Don Davies. 349

V

COUNTERRESPONSE FROM THE COMMUNITY GROUP

Resolutions Presented to the Tri-University Conference on Elementary Education 362

Discussion of the Resolutions 364

A Letter to Don Davies, Paul A. Olson 376

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

I. Community Representatives:
- Representative Ernest Morial, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Mr. John Dick, Rough Rock Demonstration School, Navajo Reservation.
- Mrs. Alice Neundorf, Rough Rock Demonstration School, Chinle, Arizona.
- Mr. Robert Norris, Fort Wingate Elementary School (New Mexico), Bureau of Indian Affairs.
- Mr. Jim Drake, Administrative Assistant to Mr. Cesar Chavez, Farm Workers Organizing Committee, Delano, California.
- Mr. Anthony Gibbs, Jr., Director, Woodlawn Educational Experiment, The Woodlawn Organization, Chicago.
- Mrs. Louise Bufford, Chicago.
- Professor Armin Beck, Director, Center for Inner City Studies, Northeastern Illinois State College.
- Miss Sue Easterling, Kentucky.
- Mrs. Zi Graves, Kentucky.
- Mr. Ernest Chambers, Omaha, Nebraska.
- Mr. Daniel M. Goodwin, Omaha, Nebraska.

II. Office of Education Representatives:
- Dr. Donald Bigelow, Director, Division of Program Administration.
- Dr. Alan Brownsword, Chief, Program Review and Implementation Branch.
- Dr. Don Davies, Associate Commissioner of Education.
- Dr. Allan Schmieder, Associate Director, Division of Program Administration.

III. University of Washington College Participants:
- Professor James D. Casteel, University of South Florida.
- Professor Dano M. Faires, West Georgia College.
- Professor Owen A. Hagen, Saint Cloud State College.
- Professor Peter J. Hovenier, Southern Oregon College.
- Professor Bernard Kravitz, California State College at Fullerton.
- Professor Fred A. Lampe, Central Missouri State College.
- Professor Albert L. Nelson, Kansas Wesleyan University.
- Professor Wes Measel, Arizona State University.
- Professor Kenneth R. Parsons, Western State College of Colorado.
- Professor Oscar Allen Rogers, Jr., Jackson State College.
- Professor Lisso R. Simmons, Northwestern State College of Louisiana.
- Professor Dorothy J. Skeel, Indiana University.

University of Washington Elementary Teacher Participants:
- Mr. Gary M. Cummings, Bellevue, Washington.
- Mr. Joseph G. Decaroli, Brookfield, Illinois.
- Miss Sylvia L. Genovese, Rocky River, Ohio.
- Miss Lynn R. Hoff, Bellevue, Washington.
- Mr. Keith E. Kirby, Denver, Colorado.
- Miss Mary Lou L. Krusic, Issaquah, Washington.
- Mr. Phillip R. Martinez, Gallup, New Mexico.
- Miss Carol J. Price, Aptos, California.
- Mr. Orval C. Schaefer, Jr., Kent, Washington.
- Miss Diane J. Soroka, New York, New York.
- Mr. Steve T. Stansberry, Alderwool, Washington.
- Miss Harriet M. Trowbridge, Mercer Island, Washington.

IV. New York University College Participants:
- Mrs. Joan Allen, University of Houston.
- Dr. Aldon Bebb, Kansas State College.
- Mr. Rodney M. Borstad, University of Illinois.
- Mr. Raymond D. Bridges, State University College.
- Professor Gladys Collins, Virginia State College.
- Miss Eveleen Lorton, University of Miami.
- Mr. John Lorton, University of Southern Mississippi.
- Miss Grace A. Lund, University of Wisconsin.
- Professor Joy Manson, Utah State University.
- Rev. Bernard Meiring, St. Josephs College.
- Professor Howard Munson, Winona State College.
- Mr. Calvin F. White, Alcorn College.

New York University Elementary Teacher Participants:
- Mr. Clyde D. Budd, Jr., El Dorado Springs, Missouri.
- Mr. Larry J. Jacobsen, Logan, Utah.
- Mr. Lyle Hurd, Snowville, Utah.
- Miss Charlotte Kinnear, Houston, Texas.
- Miss Patricia Layne, Montclair, New Jersey.
- Sister Donna Liette, Kansas City, Missouri.
- Miss Gwendolynn McDonald, Houston, Texas.
- Miss Carol Pidde, Utica, New York.
- Miss Carol Thomas, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
- Miss Georgiann Tofolo, Utica, New York.
- Mr. David Williams, Logan, Utah.

V. University of Nebraska College Participants:
- Mr. Paul C. Burns, University of Tennessee.
- Miss Loretta M. Butler, Xavier University.
- Mr. Ronald L. Cramer, Oakland University.
- Mr. John Fisher, Chico State College.
- Miss Eloise Hayes, University of Hawaii.

Miss Beverly L. Lusty, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle.
Miss Sophia P. Nelson, West Virginia State College.
Mr. Earl W. Rand, Texas Southern University.
Miss Taimi M. Ranta, Illinois State University.
Mr. Curt M. Rulon, North Texas State University.
Sister Mary Constantine, Loyola University.
Mr. DeWayne R. Triplett, Northern Illinois University.

University of Nebraska Elementary Teacher Participants:
Mr. Larry D. Baker, Pullman, Washington.
Mr. James R. Creel, Dearborn, Michigan.
Mr. Gerald A. Darling, Live Oak, California.
Mrs. Mary Ann Krueger, Columbus, Nebraska.
Mr. Ronald Lundeberg, San Francisco, California.
Mrs. Christine A. Phillips, Omaha, Nebraska.
Miss Desetta M. Spottsville, Colfax, Louisiana.
Mrs. Dixie A. Tice, Lincoln, Nebraska.
Mr. Lorenso A. Ulibarri, Raton, New Mexico.
Mr. David H. Unruh, Newark, Delaware.
Mrs. Ruth K. Vaughan, Lincoln, Nebraska.
Miss Elizabeth J. Wolfram, Rochester, Minnesota.

VI. University of Washington Staff:
Phillip Bacon
John Jarolimek
Theodore Kaltsounis
Howard Kardatske
Ambrose Clegg
Rosemarie McCartin
Anna Ochoa
Gary Manson
Elmer Williams
Arthur Nichols
Bernard Hansen
Gerald Newton
Thomas J. Pressly

New York University Staff:
Margot Ely
Edward Henderson
June McLeod
George Manolakes
Nancy Modiano
Blanche Persky

University of Nebraska Staff:
Richard Graham
Ned Hedges
Dorothy Howard
William Long
Dolores Mather
Paul Olson
Frances Reinehr
Frank Rice
Hugh Rudorf
Geoffrey Summerfield
Les Whipp

Gene Hardy: Project and Conference Coordinator

FOURTH NATIONAL CONFERENCE
of the
TRI-UNIVERSITY PROJECT IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION
Minneapolis, Minnesota, September 19-20, 1968
Gene Hardy, Conference Co-ordinator

Thursday, September 19:

8:00 a.m. . .	Registration, Hennepin Room
9:00 - 9:50 . .	"Slow Dance on the Killing Ground: Public Schools, Publics, Teachers, and Children," Dick Foster, Superintendent San Ramon Valley Unified School District
9:50 - 10:20 . .	Coffee
10:10 - 11:00 . .	Open discussion, beginning with an opportunity for comments from the community spokesmen
11:00 - 12:00 . .	Small group discussions
12:30 - 1:30 . .	Lunch, Junior Ballroom
2:00 - 2:45 . .	"Professional Competence, The American Community, and the Responsibility of the School of Education," Dean Daniel Griffiths, New York University
2:45 - 3:30 . .	"Colonialism and Paternalism in the Disciplines -- American Higher Education and American Children," Paul Ward, Executive Secretary, American Historical Association
3:30 - 4:00 . .	Coffee
4:00 - 5:00 . .	Open discussion, beginning with opportunity for comments from community spokesmen
5:00 - 6:00 . .	Small group discussions
6:30 p.m. . .	Dinner and social hour, Lakeland Room Speaker: Don Davies, Associate Commissioner, USOE.

Friday, September 20:

"The University and the Challenge of America's Children: A Response of the Tri-University Project in Elementary Education"

8:30 - 9:45 . . Mel Ezer, 1967-68 Participant at New York University

9:45 - 10:15. . Coffee

10:15 - 11:30. . Small group discussions

12:00 - 1:00 . . Lunch, Junior Ballroom

1:00 - 1:45 . . Jim Hills, 1967-68 Participant at University of Washington

1:45 - 2:45 . . Coffee

2:45 - 4:00 . . Bill Anderson, 1967-68 Participant at University of Nebraska

4:00 - 6:00 . . Final discussion period for participants and community spokesmen.

A Pride of Lions

by Paul A. Olson

The conference was about power. It was about the rights of professionals and the rights of communities in the preparation of teachers. It was about colleges (Education and the disciplines) and schools, and people who are ignored by colleges and schools when they train teachers (the higher the education, the more they seem to be ignored). We faced, with regard to the training of educational personnel, the issue which Vice-President Agnew is said to have solved with one of his famous metaphors:

> Let us encourage participation of the poor where they can make an effective contribution. But let us not confuse [sic] the disclosure of symptoms as a substitute for the wisdom of trained professionals.

Agnew's metaphor seems to suggest that the place of the community is to have diseases and disclose symptoms; the place of the professional is to cure.

Whatever the usefulness of the medical metaphor for describing the relationship between the professional and the community in other areas, one doubts that it has real uses in describing who should do what in the training of teachers. The children of poor people and of the "outsider's" cultural enclaves are not a disease. The breakdown of their schools will not be ameliorated solely, or primarily, by the doctoring of professionals. At least, the Minneapolis Tri-University Project Conference would not have admitted it.

The Nicollet Hotel with its Victorian brown oak panelling was, as Jim Drake suggested, a "poor place to begin a movement." The political conventions were a month by; Mr. Humphrey had had his troubles with his antique car; and outside the Nicollet, the artifacts with which the Great Society had blessed Minneapolis were much in evidence: a mall with some rather stumpy looking abstract sculptures and a fountain (dedicated by Mrs. Lyndon Johnson and Mrs. Hubert Humphrey) splashing merrily in its own very white light. Around the Nicollet, buildings white with functional elegance grew out of the ground like aspen trees; and the Minneapolis papers observed (during the week of the conference) the slow course of a confrontation between white and black at a local high school. Before the conference was over, someone had scrawled a number of racist obscenities on the wall of the rest room on the floor where the conference was meeting. Some people who seldom feel rage had felt an hour or two of real wrath; some had wept; some resolutions had been written and debated -- to what effect one is not exactly certain. The Pick-Nicollet Hotel was a poor place from which to begin a movement; it may be that nothing began there.

If nothing was started at Minneapolis, that may be because the people who were there were too weak. Many of the people who were speakers at -- or consultants to -- the conference had felt, in the weeks before the conference and in one form or another, the effects of the lashing and backlashing of a year of assassination, riot, and police-riot: the debilitating effects of reaction and apparent intransigency in what the New Left likes, oversimply, to call "the system." In the weeks before the conference, Mr. Foster, who spoke for the public schools, had been presented a petition with thousands of names on it to get him out as Superintendent of Schools in the San Ramon Unified School District (teachers, kids and other parents had presented other petitions to keep him); Foster was under attack for 'progressivism' and for his programs to bring black slum and white suburban kids together in integrated schools or in settings where they could talk with one another about race-in-America. Mr. Ward, who is the head of The American Historical Association, had felt in the summer of 1968 (as a member of the Office of Education's TTT Advisory Committee) the turmoil which grew not from a sense of power but from a sense of the lack of a power adequate to making history do what it ought to for America. Mr. Chambers, also interested in history, was, for all of his strength of personality, fighting a losing battle to work through conventional channels by seeking a place on the Omaha School Board, and Mr. Gibbs, the education director of the Woodlawn Organization, had been asked some very difficult questions by a Congress which was not always terribly interested in Woodlawn's answers.

That the people who led the conference in Minneapolis occupied -- many of them -- positions which were, at least in the immediate period of the conference (and perhaps also in our period generally), losing or relatively powerless positions came out in the despair, the violence, and sometimes the genteel complexity of their talk. The community people from Appalachia and from the Navajo nation in New Mexico spoke of discouragement and defeat, of stasis, of losing and the fear of losing; of a lost past and of a future powerless to be born; of being so "outside it all" that losing or winning in the "old game" didn't mean much. But if one may indulge a rhetorical flourish, many of the community people, (and many of the academicians also) spoke of a history of defeat in such a way as not to admit loss. To borrow a phrase from Armin Beck, the best of the talk at Minneapolis spoke to me and, I would hope, to education with the strength of "a pride of lions."

I do not mean the phrase in a sentimental way. Whereas Armin Beck and his discussion group were concerned that members of the teaching profession, "a herd of sheep," should for once act like "a pride of lions," no one at the meeting was concerned overmuch that such a transformation take place in the community representatives. It had already happened. They could act like a pride of lions because they knew that either America's schools and universities -- America's public institutions generally -- would allow to them and to their groups public power commensurate with their number and place in public life or the institutions would fail. They would fail because they would be destroyed or because they would destroy those whom they proposed to help.

The speakers and consultants to the conference were chosen to represent a spectrum of responsibilities in the training of teachers -- a more or less self-consciously chosen spectrum. We felt that the responsibilities of the public schools could be explained by Dick Foster and Mel Ezer (Tri-U behavioral sciences); the responsibilities of the Schools of Education could be elucidated by Dean Daniel Griffiths and Jim Hills (Tri-U social science); and the responsibilities of people in the academic disciplines by Paul Ward (History) and William Anderson (Tri-U English). We felt that insofar as education and culture are related, insofar as America's various cultural enclaves have a role in the training of both teachers and teachers of teachers, the twelve "community" representatives could speak for America's cultures.

Each was chosen because he had had some experience in developing schools in which so-called "powerless" groups had achieved some, however slight, effective force in the shaping of school policy and school training of teachers or had endeavored to achieve that sort of power. Representative Morial had initiated a number of civil rights suits in behalf of school integration and had taken an interest in a variety of other matters having to do with New Orleans ghetto school management and the training of teachers in Southern black communities and colleges; Robert Norris, John Dick, and Alice Neundorf had served in the building up of policy, curriculum, and teaching practice in Rough Rock Demonstration school (perhaps the best example of a community-controlled school developed by American Indians); Anthony Gibbs had directed, and Louise Bufford had participated in, the building of a three-cornered power bloc for running schools and training teachers in the Woodlawn area of Chicago: a bloc composed of the Woodlawn Community, the University of Chicago, and the Chicago School System; Ernie Chambers was running for the Omaha School Board and trying to influence the curriculum and the behavior of teachers on Omaha's North Side. The other community people had done equally serious kinds of work to place the mark of 'community' or cultural purpose on school policy. Jim Drake (Cesar Chavez's administrative assistant) alone of community representatives had not tried to affect schools; work for several years among migrants and pickers had made him feel educational institutions were either too irrelevant, or too hostile, to bother with. First, food, clothing, and power for the farm worker. Then education.

The speakers from academia had not been entirely outside recent battles about the distribution of power in the training of teachers and the managing of schools. Dean Griffiths, as head of the NYU School of Education, had Oceanhill-Brownsville in his backyard and some rather strenuous advocates of "community control" in his college. The three Tri-University Project spokesmen (Ezer, Hills, Anderson) had perhaps had least experience in dealing directly with issues of "community control," but their speeches indicate that they had had experience in places where the power of the outsider's community in the formation of school policy is an issue (for instance, Hills at San Francisco State and Sausalito can hardly avoid the issue). Paul Ward and Dick Foster had participated in the debates over the National TTT Advisory Panel's position paper concerning the place of the "community" in the development of EPDA programs, and Associate Commissioner Don Davies had seen the document. None of the leading participants were entirely unprepared for the heat of the meeting. However, I for one was unprepared for its light. I was not alone.

The almost universal first reaction to the meeting came when the representatives of the outsider's communities spoke, and it was a combination of hostility and sense of guilt. The second stage of the meeting came when the various college participants of the meeting said, "Let us talk about our problems" expecting to be given sympathy and "help." The third stage came when the community representatives requested of the Tri-University Project changes in policy and, again, shocked the conference. The fourth stage belongs to the period since the conference, and it has involved, for many of us, a rethinking of policy and an effort to develop meaningful sorts of action -- in response to what academic people and community people worked out together.

II.

As we have mentioned, two of the speakers at the conference (Ward and Foster) had participated in the National TTT Advisory Committee's deliberations preparatory to the formulation of its position paper to the Office of Education.[1] The position paper of the National TTT advisory committee was formulated to explain the sense and spirit of its Tucson meeting rulings to the Office of Education forwarded in May, 1968. The Tucson meeting had been a rough one. It had been called to allow the TTT committee to look at the program plans forwarded by teams composed of people from sixty-five institutions from Higher Education and an equal number of public school systems and communities. Together these groups had, in four months, devised program plans for training and retraining teachers-of-teachers: i. e. college teachers in the disciplines, college teachers in Education, and various persons who provide training to teachers when they are in-service: principals, supervisors, etc.

What the National Advisory committee found at Tucson was that a large number of institutions of Higher Education had taken lightly Commissioner Howe's general guidelines. These guidelines suggested, as a priority, that people planning programs which propose to use Office of Education funds develop them so as to make them especially fruitful for those who are not making it in our system of education. The National TTT committee's own guidelines emphasizing that programs develop, as practicum settings for the trainers of teachers, "diverse school formats" adjusted to "diverse cultural enclaves" had been taken equally lightly. In the main, Higher Education and the schools had not planned schools, school programs, or educational programs for trainers of teachers which were really tempered to culture and neighborhood. They had rather taken what they already had going and repackaged it a bit; the program plans were full of such tell-tale tags as: "The admission standards for the proposed program will be those conventional in the college; students will pursue the ordinary degree program with one variation." "The curriculum to be used in the Squareland University - Midcity TTT social science program practicum school -- for the disadvantaged -- will be that conventionally used throughout Midcity; however, in the course of the program certain remedial multi-media materials especially appropriate to the disadvantaged will be developed and tested."

---

[1] The National TTT program was, in part, modeled after the Tri-University Project and subsequently absorbed the Tri-University Project into it. The extent to which the two programs have influenced, or will influence, each other's policies is incalculable. In any case, I had organized the Minneapolis conference as a kind of extension of the TTT's board's deliberations, and made its final advisory position paper available under the assumption that the Tri-University Project would eventually fall under TTT rubrics. It since has been placed under those rubrics.

Through failure on the part of the Office of Education or the TTT Advisory Committee or through blindness in the TTT agencies -- probably through both -- a goodly number of the agencies proposing TTT programs had told a national program seeking to make a radical difference in the training of teachers in America that their business was "business-as-usual." As to the training of teachers to the burning city ghettoes and the starved and intellectually starved rural ghettoes, business would still be "as usual."

The National Advisory Committee found the failure of Higher Education and the schools to plan their TTT programs with representatives of outsiders' communities to be the scapegoat-cause of what they saw as wrong with the sixty-five program plans from some of the "most distinguished institutions in the country." The guidelines had spoken of "Higher Education (Education and the disciplines), the schools and the communities they serve" as planning together. None of the sixty-five institutions of Higher Education which submitted program plans chose to include in the planning of programs the "communities" which the programs planned to "serve". The National TTT Committee may have spoken its piece badly, but even had it said nothing, one would have thought that some programs chosing to serve "disadvantaged communities" by training teachers and teachers-of-teachers for those communities would have chosen to do some serious planning with people from the communities.

After the agony and the heat of the National TTT Committee's Tucson decisions, after the recriminations and the anxieties had been expressed by those who heard the decisions, the TTT committee tried to set down what it had come to at Tucson and in its year's experience developing the project. It formulated a rough document advisory to the Office of Education. The document reads as follows:

INTRODUCTION

Based on its deliberations over programs developed under the NDEA Title XI Triple-T Project, the TTT National Advisory Committee strongly urges the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development to consider the following recommendation when preparing the next set of guidelines for the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA): viz.,

THAT ONLY THOSE PROPOSALS SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED AND SUPPORTED WHICH MEET THE PRIORITIES AND GOALS ESTABLISHED BY THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION and which indicated an awareness of, and explicitly attempt to deal with, the more significant needs of the nation such as have been identified by the Kerner Report, the Report of the National Commission on Crime and Delinquency, the Report of the Civil Rights Commission and the Report of the Joint Commission on Mental Health, among other recent and similar documents.

The assumption of the Committee, based upon its experience with a broad cross-section of teacher training institutions and mechanisms, is that such recent analyses of our society as the above are not finding their way into the educational system -- to the detriment of society and of its children in school and that Federal assistance should primarily be directed to the correction of this situation.

The Committee believes that the training of educational personnel is partially a matter of training individuals but it is, perhaps more importantly, a matter of recreating the educational system itself so teacher and student alike can operate effectively. There is now reliable opinion on all sides which suggests that the present system of teacher training, largely developed by institutions of higher education (Colleges of Education and Colleges of Arts and Sciences), and subsequently modified by the school systems of the country, is experiencing the same difficulties the country is experiencing -- difficulties arising from poverty, injustice, and the system's exclusion of various minority groups. The right of all individuals to dignity and freedom are accepted tenets of our way of life; but our failure to provide either in all too many instances is clear. And any failure of our society to prevent all men from developing to their full capabilities -- any continued "lock-out" of individuals or groups conforming to majority-conceived norms will be a failure of the educational process and a failure in the training of educational personnel.

Surely the university system and school system to which they supply the teachers are two of the most powerful institutions in modern society. Combined, they may well be the primary institution through which society lays hold on people and through which people find their way into social structures. It could be that colleges and universities and the schools, working together with members of the communities they serve, can effect changes that may deal effectively with contemporary crises. Education seems to represent the most important power structure of our generation (substituting for the power held by industry in the late 18th and 19th centuries and by commerce or the church in earlier ones), and therefore higher education and the schools must bring into the power structure those groups formerly under-represented, groups such as Negroes, Indians, Spanish-Americans.

Just as the power structure tends to exclude the under-represented, so do academic content and the reward system of American education. The academic content now included in training programs often primarily represents an "establishment" vision of Western civilization or the English language or Western science and literary tradition. This content often fails to take account of the many perspectives from which civilizations can be viewed, especially those civilizations which have triumphed in power struggles; it often insults those people who have been victimized by power. Even seemingly "neutral" content may be meaningless to a person who regards himself as an outsider and may suggest to him that the 'system' is 'intellectually closed'. Again, the reward system of the American public school and higher education have often been primarily based on the development of intense competition among individuals and the requirement that individuals pass a series of identical hurdles in order to receive an identical reward, a grade for instance. For people who sense the possibilities for human development implicit in cooperative, rather than competitive, ways of getting things done, a training program which depends on such a system of rewards may be seen as creating rather than solving the problems which we face as a nation.

EPDA cannot be expected to provide a full remedy for all of the nation's ills. It can be expected to help cure those educational ills which surely must influence the nation's health. The Committee believes that nothing should prevent EPDA from being the key to a refocussed and revitalized educational system, one germane to the present and future needs of the nation's children. Any training program should ask itself what it is for in the larger sense, and what the members who participate in the program will see it as being for. Hence, the recommendations the National TTT Committee spells out below address themselves to matters of

a) power structure
b) academic content
c) reward systems in education, and
d) education's meaning to people.

(It should be understood that the specific recommendations which follow were developed in connection with the process of reading and evaluating programs to teach teachers of teachers. They should be used as general, though obviously not infallible, indications of the directions in which programs for the training of educational personnel which take cognizance of the national needs, are likely to go and as suggestions of how future program plans might be built.)

Section I: Matters of Power:

Any EPDA program ought to give whatever help it can toward the long-run goal of getting into the educational professions an equitable number of members of the groups presently underrepresented in American education at all stations where power is exercised (for instance, Negroes represent 11.4% of the American population; 5.7% of the teachers in America are Negroes). Proposal evaluators ought to consider the extent to which a proposal promises to bring, into stations where power is really exercised, representatives of such groups. Moreover, since the process according to which proposals are shaped is itself a political process, underrepresented groups should be made a part of that process. That is, any program developed should be a program in whose development the people -- or the kinds of people -- affected by the program will have had a voice, a program in which the representatives of underrepresented communities will have negotiated from a position of parity with representatives of institutions of higher education and school systems. Frequently, in the development of a program, the people who initiate the planning of the proposal, the conditions under which the proposal is planned, the philosophy according to which planning is done, the man who is allowed first move, etc., are crucial to the determining of who has the power in the program.

If programs which are developed under EPDA are to give real 'parity' to groups presently underrepresented in American education, 'parity' must be seen as parity by all parties involved. And when programs funded under EPDA claim that they have given this kind of equality to alienated groups or to spokesmen for outsiders' political communities (however militant they may be), then questions need to be asked at the proposal reading stage: first, and most obviously, did the parity, which ought to exist among the groups who are to be represented in the development and continuation of a program, exist in its planning in the first place? And then: specifically what powers did each group have in the planning of the program? in the distribution of the proposed budget? were the underrepresented groups involved at the beginning? Is the relationship between Higher Education and the underrepresented groups proposed for the program a non-colonial one: that is, is the relationship something healthier than one in which persons in Higher Education "know what is good for 'other' people?" Do the people in Higher Education and in the schools seek from men who come from another culture or group something more than mere personal 'acceptance' or an acquiescence in their private educational designs? Was the philosophy according to which the proposal was written a philosophy which will accomodate what each group, to which the program addresses itself, can contribute and such as will develop the political skills of underrepresented groups? Does this kind of philosophy also prevail in the continued execution of the program? Insofar as the program is directed toward giving, to all kinds of people, a sense of "belonging" to the political structure, does it recognize the rights of the program's students to be part of the shaping of the political structure of the institutions in which the program operates? Will teachers in the public schools, and students in the public schools insofar as they are part of the program, have a part in the shaping of the program's political structure? And, are the people suggested for the staff and the administration of the program people who can deliver on the basis of the agenda implicit in the foregoing or are they people who have to call all of the shots themselves?

Section II. The Academic Content of Programs and the Responses which Are Taught by the Academic Content of Programs.

The academic content of any EPDA program is important for more than 'academic' reasons. The abuse of power in American schools is very much an 'academic' matter. It has to do, among other things, with the importation into classrooms of a linguistic decorum indicative only of the power of a class, race, an age group or a professional group to demand from another group's children (as the price of success) language behaviors stylized as it wants them. It may involve the importation of curricular structures reflective of the power of an administrative hierarchy -- or a scholarly interest group -- to dictate and prevent any humane granting to the teacher of the freedom to create or reshape his own curricula in the classroom. The abuse of power may be a curricular system which asks that students learn 'generalizations' without learning the evidence, or how to collect the evidence, which led to their formation. Some pertinent questions which one might ask, when one is considering the academic content of a proposed program are:

> (1) Does the proposed program display a sense of the dignity of the style of life, linguistic habits, visions of history, etc., of groups who are not conventionally included in a predominantly white academia? (Frequently proposals will take a compensatory attitude -- an attitude 'remedial' in the pejorative sense -- toward the underrepresented groups with which they are dealing. By 'compensatory' or 'remedial' in this sense, we mean an attitude which assumes that a man has to be 'behind' before he can be helped, and which requires a sequence of failures in order to add a series of compensations.) It has been argued, and cogently, that where human failure within a system -- whether the system be education or society -- is massive, what is needed is not 'compensation' for the individual so that he may be enabled to meet the system. What is needed is change in the system. What may be needed is the development of a sense that people succeed and fail in many ways and that the norms of a program, or of schools at all levels, may be fairly artificial. What may, further, be needed is the sense that a man or a child in a training program is accepted where he is and given an opportunity to move in the most rewarding direction possible to him.
>
> (2) To urge the acceptance of the language, life style, etc., of all persons, is not to imply the rejection of technical or specialized languages; it is to imply the deliberate development of an openness to the dialect, usage styles, etc., of all groups. The language attitude here described can be taken as a symbol of a general acceptance of heterogeneity of culture.

(3) Programs ought to be funded which give serious evidence of developing the sense of history, the sense of identity, and the sense of value of personal culture of members of underrepresented groups. They ought to give clear and honest pictures of the injustices and tribalisms which have been fostered by dominant power groups in the European and American tradition.

(4) A proposal should reflect some sophistication in seeing through the 'fiction of quality' as to content (as this fiction has been developed by the American academic community). The arguments for quality, or for 'quality control,' may only be arguments in favor of the development of academic values which are primarily white or insular or representations of the vision of a rather narrow kind of scholarly group. (We do not wish to suggest here that such visions will or can be eliminated but that alternatives to them ought to be represented in the program.)

(5) A reader of a proposal ought to take great care to observe whether or not the writer of the proposal has been taken in by social science research which somehow limits his human responses. For instance, it was very fashionable a few years ago to believe that intelligence is a fixed 'item.' It has since become fashionable to believe that intelligence is generally fixed at age three or five but that an enriched environment can make a difference in early childhood. It has even more recently been argued that measures of intelligence are primarily measures of whether a man has come from a certain enclave or of what his home has been like. And the changes in policies brought about because of Head Start may suggest that we must now look at more than the immediate environment: that "Freud really did have something to say" in speaking of the family and the subjective life. If a reader suspends his intuitions as to the humanity of the program on the basis of his knowledge that it fulfills or does not fulfill the pattern proposed by some piece of research developed in the social sciences, he may judge rather badly. Readers should be sensitive in this connection to the use of social science -- or academic -- jargon which may represent the willingness of a proposal writer to appeal to academic 'fashions' rather than to do a thorough analysis of the situation with which he is dealing.

Section III: The Reward System and Values in Education.

A proposal, if it is to take cognizance of the reports listed in the introduction and of their implications (reports which, we believe, help to pin down the word 'relevancy') should show that its program, both as it applies to participants and as it applies to students in the schools, will provide for the creation of a reward system which takes cognizance of the varying ways in which men can organize themselves into groups and in which they may reward one another for the help which they give to one another or to their group. It should show that it will give to the individual student ample opportunity to affect evaluation; to take responsibility for himself; to control his own methods of study and 'create' the system according to which he evaluates himself; and, finally, to affect the external system according to which he is evaluated. It should develop his sense that he can effect changes in the social structure by giving him opportunities to affect the structure of the program which is offered to him. A program should develop in individuals -- particularly in an individual who comes from one of the white power groups who are commonly in power in this country or in an individual who comes from an alienated group which feels the oppressions of alienation so severely that it rejects other groups -- a sense of respect for heterogeneity of culture and of responsibility for other people. Any proposal which can 'develop the sense of respect for heterogeneity and responsibility,' will give clear signs that it is moving an appropriate part of American society toward a more, rather than a less, integrated situation.

The creation of relatively non-competitive situations which provide for a differentiation of roles and responsibilities among students in programs, can probably best be done by staffs who have taught themselves to be 'helpful' rather than moralistic, who enjoy seeing other people become, to the maximum degree, self-regulating, staffs who know how to encourage other people to organize themselves into groups whose primary motives are cooperative.

Section IV: 'Relevancy' and the Larger Meaning of a Program.

Under this head, one may ask, first of all, to what extent the knowledge which is proposed as part of a training program is knowledge clearly 'related' to the world of the person who participates in the program. Are the relevancies proposed purely 'practical' or purely 'liberal arts' or do they represent the full range of effective education (cf. Kohl, 36 Children), ranging from concern with what is being talked about in out-of-class life to useful skills of quite unexpected types? Similarly, to what extent will the knowledge presented in the practicum part of the program 'mean' in the lives of kids? This does not necessarily imply one or another training program format: people may, in some circumstances, be offered programs which are so overwhelmingly relevant to their immediate situations that they find themselves excited to learn what other people propose that they learn; in other circumstances, they may have to discover what is relevant on their own. However, one sometimes finds people who propose programs taking a rather superficial look at how knowledge may be rendered 'meaningful.' Sensitivity training, for instance, for two weeks at the beginning of a program does not necessarily insure a program's capacity to engage the more profound emotions. One should ask what is the goal of the program, what its purpose -- its immediate purpose and its broader, social purpose -- its interaction with the lives of the participants and of kids, its openness to influence from participants and kids, etc. And one can appropriately ask to what extent a program not only opens up opportunities to acquire knowledge but also opens up, for the participant, a sense that there are social opportunities available, that the power structure is open or can be opened up; that the system is one which can value his skills, and his influence. In this connection, one may ask whether the learning notions on which the proposal is based are notions which, rather naively, derive from a value-free social science or psychological theory? Are they based on, for instance, 'behavior shaping' notions? And, if so, do they fall victim to a temptation to fit the individual to the system without regard to the humanity of the system? If the training program itself is a closed system which regards its trainees as subjects to be shaped rather than as free men, the program is not likely to be able to represent the notion that an open system awaits the participant in the great world.

Finally, a program may be relevant but relevant in a way which damages rather than improves the social situation in which we find ourselves. It may place members of 'alienated groups' in a sort of sustained childhood at an academic table where they are fed such intellectual tidbits as may make them 'feel thankful' for being allowed to get a glimpse of a portion of the 'white bourgeois' world. One may well ask, "Does the proposal show any awareness of the serious implications of the kind of cultural arrogance which assigns merit only to value systems developed in the European tradition?" Does it assume that the only rites of passage through which a person in our society can go are rites of passage which require that a man give up his sense of identification with his traditional culture before he is allowed to move into authentic policy making positions in the larger culture? [1]

After the document was formulated at the Chicago June meeting of the National TTT Advisory Board and forwarded to the Office of

---

[1] The men who participated in the formulation of the document were Robin Anderson (Dean of Arts and Sciences, University of Arkansas); Tony Campbell (Responsive Environments Corporation, Washington, D. C.); Richard Foster (Superintendent of Schools, San Ramon, California); Vernon Haubrich (Educational Policies Department, University of Wisconsin); Robert Hogan (Executive Secretary, National Council of Teachers of English); J. N. Hook (former Executive

Education, no one knew exactly what should be done with it or what procedure should be followed in giving an advisory document its proper advisory force. No committee exactly like the TTT committee had been created by the Office of Education before, and no document exactly like its advisory document proposed. But the Office of Education subsequently decided that the sensible thing would be to undertake discussions as to what in the document should be rejected, what incorporated in one way or another into guidelines, and what supported through efforts to 'educate' and 'sensitize.' One may take Mr. Davies' speech ("We Have Met the Enemy") as indicating where Mr. Davies stood on the issues of, say, "community involvement" in the planning of Bureau of Educational Personnel programs at the time of the Minneapolis conference.

The Tucson and Chicago meetings of the TTT lead into the Tri-University Minneapolis meeting.

Secretary, National Council of Teachers of English); Madison Judson (Fayerweather School, Newton, Massachusetts); John Letson (Superintendent of Schools, Atlanta, Georgia); Bertram Masia (Western Reserve University); Tony Milazzo (University of Michigan); Paul Olson (Department of English, University of Nebraska); Arthur Pearl (School of Education, University of Oregon); Bill Rioux (Merrill-Palmer Institute, Detroit, Michigan); James R. Tanner (Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Cleveland, Ohio); Anderson Thompson (Forrestville High School, Chicago, Illinois); Matthew Trippe (Chairman, TTT Advisory Committee, Special Ed., University of Michigan); Paul Ward (Executive Secretary, American Historical Association); Ed Weaver (Dean of Education, Atlanta University); Dustin Wilson (Superintendent of Schools, Dover, Delaware). Later the document since it was drawn up in a necessarily brief session by very busy people was sent back to the committee for final clarification and offered to the Office of Education for its use. Saul Cohen of the American Council of Graduate Schools was not able to be at the Chicago meeting of the TTT committee because of obligations which he had in Europe. He had been one of the primary forces in the National TTT, but he had some initial reservations about the document drawn up in Chicago (that it might be taken to too literally or used overly literally). He suggested amendments to the piece which clarified it and has publicly supported it, provided its spirit and intentions are understood and its letter is not insisted upon where it is of dubious relevance. Few members of the original TTT advisory committee would have disagreed with Mr. Cohen's desire that what we should seek is that above document be kept in every relevant EPDA program rather than its every nit picking and -- for some programs -- irrelevant detail. Since the document was written, it has become fashionable in some quarters to treat it as a 'radical document,' but the men who formulated it were distinguished administrators and scholars, some of them very conservative indeed. It should also be said that no one who participated in the formulation of the Chicago TTT document would subscribe to its every detail.

III.

If Minneapolis did not buy Mr. Agnew's metaphor of the professional as the active doctor and the community as the sick patient, it was not anti-professional. Mr. Gibbs was not. His committee was not. But what the conference said concerning what the professional must do to put his own house in order is likely to be lost in the examination of what it said about the mutual obligations binding professionals (teachers and teachers of teachers) and identifiable community or cultural groups. In speaking of the professional's responsibility as a professional, Dick Foster said that teachers and teachers of teachers in the schools have to be bright and humane; Dean Dan Griffiths said that Colleges of Education have to be professionally competent, and then he spelled out what is requisite to competence; and Paul Ward argued that scholars who train teachers and work with community groups can "know" without "knowing better" and can present what is meaningful to a student -- a teacher-to-be from almost any cultural enclave -- both without patronizing and without sacrificing scholarly integrity. That the conference said, positively, that professionals could do -- or ought to do -- various things is less obvious than that it said what they have not done and, thereby, implied where duty lay. The sound and fury which came from the community representatives who acted as consultants to the conference was meaningful. It was not easy to take. It had to do with the professional's obligations both to America's communities and to intellectual honesty.

At the end of the conference, the community representatives who were consultants to the conference presented to it a series of eleven resolutions -- ten of which were in essence supported by the conference. The resolutions in some cases confirm and in some cases extend the TTT document. But whereas the TTT document was formulated by academic people, the Minneapolis document was formulated by the representatives of the underrepresented communities concerning whom the TTT document spoke and is, therefore, the more meaningful. The resolutions speak for themselves (cf. Infra., final section). So also do the differences of opinion which existed within the conference and which came to a head in the final session when the resolutions were presented. However, that the reader may better understand the Minneapolis resolutions and their relation to the TTT document, it may be useful to create, under the four heads used in the TTT advisory committee's paper -- Power, Academic Content, Reward Systems, Meaning -- a mosaic of remarks made at Minneapolis which were particularly striking and which may have been important in moving the "community" group toward its final set of resolutions and in gaining the general support of the "academic" group for them (the speaker of each remark -- where speakers are known -- is identified immediately after the remark). We begin with Power:

I. Power:

1. Power and Dignity: I think that Negroes and poor people, both white poor and black, have to move from a position of strength. You can't get a man to do anything if you're afraid of him. You have to deal with him from a position of strength. You have to negotiate from strength, from the ever abiding threat, that you're going to put him out of business whether it's by "burning him down" or whether it's by picketing his place to such an extent that his margin of profit is reduced so much that he can't operate.

The same thing has to be done with the school boards. Pressure has to be put on the school boards and on the teachers. Teachers are going to have to make their own effort by stepping and moving out into the communities and participating in the self-help programs that are being conducted now by Negroes -- street academies in New York, and other things of this sort -- and by going into the communities and saying, "We have special talent, we have special skill, and we are ready to work with you and co-operate with you and talk on a man to man basis with these people." The whole fundamental thing is dignity. It's dignity for a man to be treated as a man and as another man's equal. And this is what Chambers was talking about. And this is what he said to Dick Foster when Foster asked him that question. He said, "Treat me like a man and I'll treat you like one."

Representative Ernest Morial,
Louisiana

* * *

2. Power and Blackboard Jungles: It isn't the kids that are creating the jungle. It's the bureaucracy; it's a staff that doesn't know how to cope with what the reality of urban education is today. There isn't enough money. The humanness is gone. I don't think you can blame the teachers directly for being nonhuman. They're simply reflections of the dehumanization of urban life within what we commonly call the inner city.

Conference Participant

* * *

I certainly do[see how the circle of dehumanization and terror can be broken.] One thing I would say is that Morris High School in the Bronx, for example, should come under control of the community. I think that there should be a community school board that has virtually total power in that school system. I think that what's desperately needed is to make teachers accountable for their behavior.

Conference Participant

* * *

3. Reform and Power: How can these persons who want to bring about educational reform in our American system do it if they are unable to develop the type of power and the type of 'clout' that's necessary to change boards of education and to change the attitudes of superintendents and make them responsive to needs of people such as Mr. Dick, to the needs of people in Appalachia, to the needs of the ghetto boy and girl who live in the slums of America; in the urban centers and pockets of poverty in this nation? How can we do the reforming if it isn't coupled with a power concept?

Representative Ernest Morial

* * *

4. Power and Multicultural Schools: An awful lot of the people at the present time don't want to 'melt.' They are powerless, they're poor and in many cases there aren't a great many of them. So I think for these groups the only thing they can do is to change the public school system. They've got to get the public school system in their communities to drop the 'melting pot' concept and to introduce the multicultural concept as the ideology of American public school.

Dean Daniel Griffiths, NYU

* * *

5. Powerlessness in the Navajo Nation: No Melting Pot: Our problems are quite invisible. We are faced with indifference. We are faced with things like paternalism. Our hands are tied to something we don't know. There are laws.

* * *

Just take this as an example: we are told we have a reservation; you grow up believing that this is your land, this is your hogan; this is the way it is going to be always. When you go into looking at the law books, it says in so many words that this is government land.

* * *

I'm being sat on by someone I cannot do without.

Mrs. Alice Neundorf,
Navajo Nation

* * *

6. The Sense of Power in a Community Controlled School: The way it is right now, everything goes out the window except what Mr. Dick and his group (the community board, Rough Rock Demonstration School) set as policy. If they want to hire someone who has never finished high school but is competent, in their thinking, to take their kids and teach them, this is what we do. As a matter of fact, one of our very best teachers has gone up to about the eighth or tenth grade. And she is taking over the beginning class. She speaks both English and Navajo.

Mrs. Alice Neundorf

* * *

7. Black Power and Education: In Chicago not so long ago a meeting of Afro-American educators was called for us by some of us. None of you were called, none of you were there; we wanted to get together ourselves and not have to have you there snooping. . . . We wanted to do some planning among ourselves. . . . Divide and rule has been America's way with us, as it has been with the poor white folks, but especially with us. We have always been encouraged to betray one another. Of the hundreds of slave revolts which were attempted or planned, the majority were betrayed by house servants.

Conference Participant

* * *

8. Black Community Power and Teacher Training: Now we talk about power in education. Should a community have a voice in education? That becomes a question. I think the question is whether the community controls the schools. I think the schools in fact belong to the community, that the community should set the needs and goals of education, and the professionals have the responsibility to design the program. We're not going to try to come in and be the educators; we're not going to come into the classrooms and teach. We're going to say that here's a community that has certain kinds of needs, certain aspirations for us here. How many teachers really know that a parent in a black poor urban ghetto wants her son to be a doctor.

Anthony Gibbs, The Woodlawn
Organization

* * *

9. Black Power; Sharing Power: I think what Mrs. Bufford [from the Woodlawn Organization] said yesterday was extremely interesting: "We finally brought it down that we, the parents, had to have one vote and the teachers had to have one vote, no matter how powerful they were or how many they were. So we won, they won." This is the senate way of voting. And in this way you can start to build the sort of program that can result in radical changes within the school.

Armin Beck, Center for
Inner City Studies

* * *

10. The Community Movement And Schools For The Dispossessed Generally: I think what we heard from the Navajo Indian, Mr. Dick, was certainly an example of what we have become, and I say 'we' collectively. I'm going to even include myself in this, even though I'm generally left out of most things; I'm going to get involved in this myself because somehow I feel, even in my plight, somewhat responsible for where the Navajo is today. We've got to form a coalition between him and me some way. I'm going to have to try to learn some Navajo Indian talk and try to take my techniques and my skills as an organizer and see if we can work something out together so that we can begin to do something

about that problem, because as long as any one of us is not free to enjoy what the masses are enjoying or have the potential to enjoy, then all of us are enslaved. . . .

Anthony Gibbs, Woodlawn

* * *

And that's whats wrong with education -- it hasn't become a movement. . . [It] would make sense to me that that's the way they would control the direction and spontaneity of education with public money. . . This is. . . a deadly way to get a movement started, coming to the Nicollet Hotel. I think the philosophy that Cesar has infused most Mexican-Americans with who have taken seriously their future and what they can do to change, is that nobody, but nobody, is going to help the Mexican-American. The educator is not going to help the Mexican-American, the church is not going to help the Mexican-American, the government and welfare is not going to help the Mexican-American -- I should say farm worker, because it's very multiracial.

Jim Drake, Farm Workers'
Organizing Committee

* * *

I was just talking to Drake and this is what they're trying to create, this set of circumstances wherein the individual has no choice but to become a lion.

Armin Beck, Inner City Studies

* * *

11. Other Kinds of Power Structures; Present Powers 'Educating' Teachers; Bureau of Indian Affairs: 'The power structure is something like a sack of laundry. . . You kick it. It'll accommodate you. . . . And it won't do a thing.

Robert Norris, B.I.A. teacher and
Member of the Navajo Nation.

* * *

And the thing about public education and boards of education is, who do they always put on the boards of education? The President of Chase Manhattan Bank in New York for instance, whose kids went to all the private schools that existed. But he's on the public board of education messing with other folks' kids' lives. He's concerned, I'm sure. That's why he sent his kids to private schools because he was concerned.

Anthony Gibbs, Woodlawn

* * *

[If you try to create a free education and respond to 'outsider's communities], the local sheriff will come along -- and he usually has high boots -- and he'll say, "Our problem is due to permissiveness in the school." You'll start getting letters to the Board of Education with the copies to the newspapers, some signed, some unsigned. . . . They'll be planned cell meetings before the next board meeting on how they're going to operate in the next meeting -- and by the way, we've had meetings in which there has been a call master, Daley style, who calls the shots as to who's talking next. There'll be a series of telephone calls to the Board, and there'll be telephone calls to the Superintendent, mysterious ones in the middle of the night. I've had it put as nicely as, "We're planning to lynch you."

Dick Foster, Superintendent of
School, San Ramon Unified District

* * *

But I say first of all, you have created the segregated schools; integration has failed. You tried bussing -- and here's where power comes in -- that the whites in the other neighborhood say, "We don't want them niggers on these blocks." And you turned around and said, "That program can't work." That's power; but everybody wants the people who ain't got no power not to get none by saying, "Power is corrupt."

* * *

Take for instance a white suburban community that's opposed to black people moving in or being bussed in or whatnot: what happens when a teacher stands up in a classroom and says that this is a bigoted community, that your parents are prejudiced? You know what's going to happen to that teacher -- that teacher's gone. But people are saying that black people shouldn't have that same right. What happens when a racist principal comes into a black community and he don't care about those black kids and the community says, "We don't want this guy here?" The board of education says, "We don't care what you want, he's staying." You've destroyed all the hope that people had. You wonder why people go out and burn buildings? That's why they do it, because every step of the way they had no control over nothing.

Anthony Gibbs, Woodlawn

* * *

12. The Office of Education spokesman: Communities and the education of teachers: The teacher's role in the future must be forged in a crucible which contains the community (the whole community), the teachers' associations, and the unions (and I think that these two should never be overlooked for one minute), and the country as a whole; that is, there should be a national view of the role of the teacher, the university and the students, focused on the university since it will be held responsible.

Associate Commissioner
Don Davies, USOE

II. Academic Content:

1. Content That Means: In our school we are teaching two cultures. We are offering a choice between the modern way of life and the way of the Navajos in the years past and at the present time. We want to have the children make a choice from both sides. We're not saying, "You

must stay on the reservation and be as Navajos always have been before." We are saying, "We have the choice. You can learn both ways and be strong in both ways." We're not saying, as in the past the government has said, that you can completely change into the way of the modern society.

I am not saying that the government schools have not done a job that should have been done; they were successful in some ways. But they have forgotten that we have a culture; that we have a language; that we have a religion; that we also have a life that has been successful in the past; that theirs is not the only way; that we want our children to be like us, not like someone else. We want them to be successful, and to be successful they must know what is going on around them outside the reservation. I know how hard it is when you do not understand English; everywhere you go, you must have someone tell you how to get around and how to behave. It is very hard, and I want my children to know both. I want them to be experienced in both. But first of all I want them to be proud of being a Navajo.

John Dick, Member of the
Navajo Nation.

* * *

One person that I know has his students in the "Social Foundations"[1] course build their own, but only after investigation in the neighborhoods of the city and reporting a discussion on these things, continually asking questions of the people they meet in the neighborhoods, "Well, who causes you trouble?" Then they say, "Well, we're getting along okay, but there's this outfit over here." And then you ask the same question, "What causes you trouble?" and before long you get down in the black community to the people who are not in the headlines, not the Ernie Chamberses, but the others who are just as active. For example, in Cincinnati a colleague of mine began scratching the black community and came across a man who has a Ph. D. in social science but refuses to practice his trade. (Instead he runs the black art studies in Cincinnati and barely ekes out a living.) He told my colleague that by April there would be several thousand black people thrown out of the Cincinnati schools for bad behavior. Sure enough in April, Superintendent Miller expelled fourteen hundred students from Cincinnati's junior and senior high schools. This was common knowledge for anyone who cared to scratch for it. In the "Social Foundations" work this is the sort of information that the students ought to be investigating.

Armin Beck, Inner City Studies

* * *

---

[1] A College of Education course in "The Social Foundations of Education."

2. Content That Does Not Mean: Even the Indians themselves do not know anything about their own history. Very little has been put in their textbooks. And at the college level there is practically nothing said in American history about the American Indians and the directions which their culture has taken.

Alice Neundorf, Navajo Nation

* * *

The Navajos still have their culture and their language. We don't have ours. We're trying to get it back through black Afro-American history. . . . What was our ancestors? Slavery very systematically took them away. . . .

Anthony Gibbs, Woodlawn
Organization

* * *

. . . . to recognize. . . . and remove from formulations of subject matter any implicit assumption that the scholar's own class and subculture are intrinsically superior. . . .

Paul Ward, Executive Secretary,
American Historical Association

* * *

Thomas Jefferson -- another great one who talked about the right of every man to be free because God created every man the same, who said that from this same creation we have to have the same rights -- he was holding black people as slaves. Nine favorite black women, and he was making babies and his wife said, "Thomas, leave those women alone." And Mr. Jefferson, acknowledging how beautiful the black sister is, how much soul she has -- like this man said how 'humanized' we are -- he said, "Mrs. Jefferson, I'll leave you alone first." And he continued making his little bastards. But then when he decided to assume the role of the pious hypocrite, like a lot of you are going to do, he said, "Slavery is a terrible thing, degrading submission on the one hand, terrible depotism on the other, and our children observe this and they imitate it." And then he went on to tell other terrible things and he said, "I tremble for my country when I remember that God is just and that his justice cannot sleep forever."

But he did not tremble enough to free his slaves. How can a man make me think that God means anything to him, when in one breath he can acknowledge the existence of God and His justice, the right of every man to be free, and yet hold slaves. You all lied to us in school.

Ernest Chambers, Omaha
Community

* * *

Mr. Foster is not personally responsible for George Washington, but he's responsible if he doesn't break down the old mythology of George Washington, that sham semi-God status that he holds, and put him in his proper perspective and let young white people know that the hero for them is not this powder-wigged, military-uniform-wearing individual.

Ernest Chambers, Omaha Community

* * *

One day during a history lesson he[1] looked up at me and he said, "How come you kept us pickin' cotton so long?" . . .

Conference Participant

* * *

I look around and I see a white child sitting here and a white child sitting there, what did I have to be proud of? What could I go home and tell my mother and my father about my black ancestors? What did they do in history? The black man was in chains. The black man got beat. A black man ran away in the woods and got hunted down by a dog. Do I want to go home and tell my little sisters and brothers things like that? I want to go home and tell them the good things about the black person.

Kathryn Walker, Student

* * *

Not just to teach that the first man to die in the War of Independence was a black man. That's not so much important as why the War of Independence was really being fought, and its relationship to the contemporary situation of black people rebelling against this system.

Anthony Gibbs, Woodlawn

* * *

Teachers. . . "behavioral science illiterates," as they have been rightly termed by Kenneth Clark.

Dean Dan Griffiths, NYU

* * *

Anybody that teaches in Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, should be able to speak Spanish, or they're not communicating with the kids or the parents. . . .

Jim Drake, Farm Workers

* * *

There are some good programs. . . . English as a second language for Navajos. . . . used a textbook for Spanish speaking people. . . .

* * *

[The textbooks] have no real relevance to what's going on in the Southwest.

Robert Norris, Navajo Nation

* * *

---

[1] A sixth grade elementary school student.

II. Content

The products of schools of education are much like so many of their professors, atheoretical, anti-intellectual, pragmatic, and above all practical. Therein lies the major reason for the sad state which public education finds itself in today. And this is as true in the Office of Education as it is in the 50 state education departments; as true in the cities as in the towns. This basic deadly weakness has prevented the university graduate schools of education from being the wellspring of knowledge, the developer of methodology, and the fountainhead of new ideas with which to regenerate the schools.

Dean Dan Griffiths, NYU

III. Reward Systems in Education

1. Rewards; Intrinsic and Extrinsic: The fourth thing that higher education and the disciplines can do is probably the most important: to give attention to the way in which intrinsic and extrinsic rewards of learning in fact shape the process of learning. Good education as I understand it -- this will not surprise you after what I've said -- is in part a leading of young minds into new worlds of reality, ones to which they would otherwise be insensitive and ignorant. Higher education has traditionally emphasized the intrinsic rewards of such new fields of study, as contrasted with extrinsic rewards. Here I'm thinking of extrinsic rewards such as the unexpected usefulness of a bit of information for current topical conversation among age-mates, the future use of what is learned for a possible paying job -- the paying job ahead -- even the relevance of an issue encountered for a personal debate going on at that moment in the student's inner life. But many a subject of study has in fact itself been shaped by the choosing of items likely to have such extrinsic rewards. These rewards are, so to speak, buried in advance in the ground the students will go over, buried either by the teacher or by the literary artist for his readers, just as both of them have worked over the intrinsic rewards that are already there and to be discovered.

Paul Ward, American Historical Assoc.

* * *

2. Extrinsic Rewards, Kinds and Conditions: A man's prestige in the academic marketplace is based almost wholly upon the research he has done. His prestige will determine his place, and vice-versa, until the circularity of prestige leading to place, and place to prestige, becomes a true Gordian knot. And as a final chilling note to the overemphasis on research, consider the following excerpt from The Academic Marketplace by Theodore Caplow and Reese McGee:

> Q: Are the men's publications read?
> A: Oh, yes!
> Q: By whom?
> A: By the tenure members, at least.
> Q: All of them?
> A: Yes.

Q: Did you read them?

A: Yes.

Q: Did you read those of the man you finally hired?

A: Yes.

Q: What was the one which you remember best about?

A: Well. . . . I didn't read it, exactly. I looked it over. It was in a good journal. Nothing trashy gets in there.

Q: What do you mean by you "looked it over"?

A: Well, I looked at it, looked at his references, read his abstract.

Q: Is that the way the rest of the committee handles the publications, do you think?

A: I think so, yes, they look them over.

Professor William Anderson,
San Fernando Valley State College

* * *

When people like me are denied the privilege of going inside the one-room school I have fought to keep my children in because 'I was going to destroy their books,' it was because I was awakening the people to the fact that a PTA might cause a better school system. Our PTA wanted to form. They wouldn't let us form because 'there was no need for it.' It would rock the boat a little bit. So the superintendent says, "No PTA. We don't have time for it. We have other things to do."

These are the pities of Appalachia; and it isn't only Rock Castle County. Children have to walk two miles out to go to school and then not get a hot lunch. There are hot lunch programs in some of the schools, but not every school in Appalachia has a hot lunch. Pity the child that goes all day long in school with nothing under his belly except maybe a little cornbread for breakfast because he doesn't have a hot lunch. The hot lunch program doesn't reach him. Some of them have the hot lunch program if they have a quarter to pay for their dinner. Are there any of you families could take ten kids and feed them and give a quarter a lunch for all ten kids to keep them in school on $225.00 a month plus the food and the clothes they have to have?

Zi Graves, Appalachian Community
Leader

* * *

I can remember when I went to kindergarten. I was as enthusiastic as hell. I had a nice little new briefcase. What was I going to do with a briefcase in kindergarten? But my mother had an idea she wanted to send her son off to kindergarten prepared for whatever might happen, so the briefcase was necessary. And I went in and I sat down. And I saw kids crying because their mothers were leaving them. And I say, "What are they crying for? I'm glad to be in school." My big brothers and sisters had gone on before me, and I was left behind. So the first day I got there I was enthusiastic. But it wasn't long before all that was whipped out of me. I think before I got to the third grade, I dreaded going because of what it had become. The students weren't turned on. I come from a community in Chicago; if you haven't heard of the community, you've heard of the Blackstone Rangers. An educational program failed there; that's why they have the Blackstone Rangers today.

Anthony Gibbs, Woodlawn Organization

* * *

Navajos value cooperation as opposed to competition. Cooperation is what our culture is based upon.

Robert Norris, Navajo Nation

* * *

What is a teacher profile to our students? What are we doing to set an example for our students? Where are our future teachers coming from? How do they feel about you as teachers? What do they see? Do they want to be a teacher from looking at you? Do they respect you enough? Are you creating this kind of an impression on our youngsters, to make them want to go into the teaching profession? Or are we pushing them out? I find in Appalachia, a lot, our teachers are pushing our children out of the profession because they have such a hard front. And they're pushing them out of school. They're not dropouts, they're pushouts. So where are we going to recruit our future teachers, our true teachers?

Zi Graves, Community Leader
Appalachia

* * *

And if the teacher can give enough respect of herself to the child, if he respects and loves her enough. . . .

Zi Graves, Community Leader

* * *

Why are these people, who I feel are perverted and sadistic and the kind of people who become prison guards so they can have captives, do these things? (Teachers who attack children) Then other teachers in the building who know about it play like it doesn't go on and defend the school and say it's an unjustified attack on the teachers. If you had any esprit de corps, you would be quicker to want to weed that person out than I, because you want to elevate your profession and you want it to have standing. But instead you show us there is honor among thieves. And since all of you gather together to justify and defend this incompetent, it tends to make us feel "birds of a feather flock together," and whereas his incompetency was revealed today, yours will be revealed tomorrow. But if you're confident of your position and you know that you're right, you don't fear me or anybody like us. You see us as your friends, because we all say we want the children to be educated.

Ernest Chambers, Omaha Community

III. Reward Systems

The repair syndrome won't work.[1]

Dick Foster

* * *

Alternate routes to teaching careers are urgently needed in order to get more minority teachers into urban schools. At San Francisco State College we have a "new careers" program which waives entrance requirements, provides for educational and personal counseling, gives financial assistance via work-study arrangements, and enables freshman entrants to take up to a year and a half of college course work without grades.

Jim Hills, San Francisco State
College

* * *

IV. Education's Meaning to People:

1. We can't separate education from the problems that exist today . . . . racism. . . .

Representative Ernest Morial

* * *

The government has taught our children for many years. And many years have passed in which our children have been taught by someone else in someone else's way. We finally decided that a person with many degrees behind him, or a person with high school education or more, does not always know what is best for our children.

John Dick, Navajo Nation

* * *

I think the basic reason is that our society has a school system which is developed in such a way that it's meant to provide a commodity for the market -- the well-rounded mediocrity that goes to college and then fits into the upper echelons of our society that control the little people down here. So we have Columbia University preparing for a war this year over the sources of their money and the sources of their power. And we have the University of California at Davis preparing for a war this year, because for years and years they've turned out machines and ideas and systems for agriculturalists in California, which have amassed huge amounts of money for a very small five per cent of the farm workers in the state.

Jim Drake, Farm Workers Committee

* * *

How can we get out of this? (i.e. poverty and conservatism in Eastern Kentucky). What is education going to do for us?

Sue Easterling, Community Leader
Appalachia

* * *

---

[1] i.e. compensatory education.

It is worthwhile, people. The children in Appalachia, their future is in the educators' hands; and my God, until they can realize the future of these children, what you put out into Appalachia, what you put into the ghettos, that is our pride. That's all we have. We have nothing but our children. We are poor people. We live in the mountains. We love the mountains, and live in the mountains. Our children is the only thing we have. 'They've' got everything else; 'they' have our coal, 'they' have our minerals. And 'they' aren't taking our kids. We need those children educated. We need to show them a better way of life.

Zi Graves, Appalachia

* * *

The attitude of the teachers is. . . . Just drill them with stuff. . . . My brother. . . . the kid's ruined. . . .

Sue Easterling, Appalachia

* * *

Participant: What do you mean, adult education? Or are you working toward your children's eduction?

Mr. Drake: Right now we don't need either, because the adults are working in the fields and they're always going to work in the fields and the children are working in the fields and they're always going to be working in the fields until the adults can make a real living out of working in the fields. So right now, that kind of education, no. What I'm talking about is political organization, that type of education.

Participant: You can't have citizenship classes without some minimal reading and writing ability for each of those people. This is our problem, as educators.

Mr. Drake: But I don't think you'll find a Mexican-American who doesn't write in Spanish.

Participant: So, what you'd want would be political classes in Spanish, then? They don't speak English very well.

Mr. Drake: It's not classes. Forget the whole thing about classes; just get classes out of your mind. First of all you've got to find the people in the community who are just interested in changing things.

Jim Drake, Farm Workers'
Organizing Committee

IV. Education's Meaning:

Now the next thing that higher education and the disciplines can do, and must do I think, is to throw the weight of their influence against the current over-valuing of grades and I.Q.'s and class standings. Just as present conditions are making education in our country a much more powerful engine for socializing youngsters, irrespective of their feelings, the educational structure is being used, relied upon more than ever before in history, as a screening device to decide who'll be allowed to rise into positions of status and power.

Paul Ward, American Historial
Association

* * *

I would take most of the teachers I've met and try to avoid even speaking with them because of the type of awareness that they have. Their awareness seems to be that which is gotten from books. Most of the teachers that I speak with sound like a sociology book -- some type of book on statistics or something. And I found that most students that I talked with can't take this type of people. These people are not real people. As Joe said before, they're not human beings, to me they are books. I mean they are imprisoned in pages.

Randy Williams, Student

* * *

I was teaching a course in black history this summer; I also taught the children the meaning of words, the necessity of understanding words, what a dictionary is, how to distinguish a dictionary from an encyclopedia. But when they left and people asked them what they had been studying, they said, "Black history" because that's what it was called. So you don't have to restrict what you're teaching. You are a total human being in the classroom. So, even though you might be teaching art, if something comes up about science, you should be versatile enough to speak about it because you want the child to learn something about it all. If you're less than the child, don't expect him to be more than you.

Ernest Chambers, Omaha Community

My juxtaposition of short passages, wrenched from their context and placed in a new context, is deliberate. It is my way of summarizing my sense of the meeting's form and pressure. For I am quite sure that I cannot adequately capture the cross currents of the conference in my own words.

Many questions remained after all the talk was done: what should be the precise procedures for selecting representatives of underrepresented groups in differing groups (the committee headed by Mr. Gibbs may have something to say along those lines)? To what degree can the "community" set goals for programs without also being involved in their day-to-day operation? Are there really human communities which cannot be trusted to govern themselves?

Many of the questions raised at Minneapolis are the products of a very ancient history of mismanagement in America. What is needed to deal with them, with white time's curling malice, is not elegance of procedure but the will to deal with problems. That will was in the community people. Mr. Dick spoke with the wisdom of a ten thousand year old civilization; slavery was at Minneapolis, and slaveowners were in the schools; Newgate prison and bonded thugs and thieves let loose on the hills of Appalachia; the quiet wisdom of the Franciscans and the Mexican-American war. We have been cursed by our conquests; and education has been what we have provided to make the conquest complete. The alliance of which Jim Drake speaks between teachers and outsiders' communities, between Higher Education and the poor, may come; but that alliance lies well beyond the horizon of 1968, one suspects.

An essay published recently by Norman Mailer in Look magazine (January 7) discussing black power comes as close to anything I know to capturing the issues at large at Minneapolis. I wish to end with a quotation from that essay. (Should the reader look at the whole essay, he would find that where Mailer says black, he could, in using it as a gloss on Minneapolis, substitute the adjective appropriate to any of the groups there: brown, Appalachian, Navajo, or whatever; the essay would then do as a gloss on the whole of Minneapolis):

> The technological society is not able to deal with the self-image of separate peoples and races if the development of their self-image produces personalities of an explosive individuality. We do not substitute sticks of dynamite for the teeth of a gear and assume we still have an automotive transmission.

Our systems for training teachers of teachers and teachers are the centrally efficient gears in the systems of our technological society. We were faced with "separate peoples and races" whose self-image had produced "personalities of an explosive individuality;" and we do not yet know how to educate teachers to act in a world of gears and dynamite, sheep and lions. We might wish for more lions among the teachers of elementary teachers, whether they be college administrators and teachers, or school bureaucrats and training personnel. We will eventually get them; the lions of the community will demand them.

MUTUAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE TRAINING OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

The School Systems of America
    Dick Foster

Higher Education
    The Disciplines
        Paul Ward

Education
    Dean Dan Griffiths

Slow Dance on the Killing Ground:
Public Schools, Publics, Teachers, and Children

Mr. Dick Foster
Superintendent of Schools, Berkeley, California

Dick Foster has been the Superintendent of Schools of the San Ramon Valley Unified School District. Recently he resigned. Prior to his resignation he had endeavored to make various arrangements for bussing black inner city kids into his suburban district; he had encouraged talk between black militant adolescents from the Oakland - San Francisco inner city area and the students attending the suburban high schools of his district. He had encouraged educational newness of the sort which he describes.

A recent issue of the San Francisco Chronicle described a meeting of parents, students, and teachers in Mr. Foster's district protesting Mr. Foster's "progressivism" and his interest in developing antidotes to racism among the young; if I recall the story correctly, the claim was that between two and three thousand parents were opposing Foster, and about equal numbers supporting him with various sorts of petitions. Mr. Foster has been a consultant to the U. S. Office of Education, to the Sausalito Project at San Francisco, to the National TTT Project, and to the National Institute on the Disadvantaged. And he is not done with our schools now; he has recently been appointed Superintendent of Schools in Berkeley.

But he now knows that to be serious about transforming schools and educating teachers and parents now is to take risks. The risks of not doing anything are, of course, incalculably greater.

Mr. Foster speaks, in the remarks which follow, as the representative of the power exercised by schools in the training of teachers. He speaks, primarily to Higher Education, of the "power realities" which men who administer schools face -- realities which shape what teachers do and what administrators decide.

Slow Dance on the Killing Ground:
Public Schools, Publics, Teachers, and Children

Dick Foster
San Ramon Valley Unified School District

The one thing I can do as a practicing superintendent is to tell those of you who are sitting in that wonderful cocoon called the university or college what it's like out there. That's really what I'd like to talk about, because maybe when I get through, you'll decide that the best thing you can do is stay in the cocoon, hibernate beautifully, thinking that the little amount of militancy that you're now engaging in is important and stay the hell out of the real task, which you've done successfully for so long.

Let me say one thing in beginning. I've been a superintendent in the white ghetto; I have been a superintendent in the black and white ghetto; I've been a teacher and a principal in the black ghetto. And what I have to say to you is that there ain't much difference. They all look and smell about alike when you begin to talk about what we're trying to do as far as education is concerned.

Suppose you happen to be a person who is committed -- and I define commitment at the present time as exercising responsible, meaningful power for a change in a system or subsystem. What happens to you in a public school at the present time if you go this particular route? We know what happens to you in our culture if you begin to talk about responsible change: they kill you -- you know, Martin Luther King, two Kennedys. I think Myrdal in An American Dilemma was probably right; he said he's afraid that in this culture we'll reach the time that a human being who sticks his head above the sand will get shot.

Now they don't kill you in American education with a gun, they kill you psychologically. And they do a beautiful job of it; I'd like to describe the kinds of ways that the killing takes place. Let's assume just for a minute that you try to operate a meaningful, responsible school in America at the present time. You decide that you're going to use all the research and all the know-how and all your gut intuition for that kind of a school. Suppose you decide that a graded system of a school is one of the American "big lies." There is no such thing as the third grade or the fourth grade. We'll either go ungraded, or multigraded, or some kind of a combination where you don't care about grades. Let's suppose you build a school like the one we just opened this fall. It is a total open space in which there are no interior walls, and has a great big central instructional area of about nine thousand square feet. Then it has three pods that have space for six classrooms in each pod, and there are no walls. The old adage of the teacher who used to be able to say "When I close my door and go into my classroom, nobody knows what I'm doing" (and I used to add "Not even the teacher") is gone. You're right out there in the open, teaching in a collaborative sort of way (and I'm not using the word 'team-teaching'; I'll have something to say about that later).

Suppose you decide to open up a kindergarten that really follows Froebel's hypothesis that a kindergarten ought to be a place where children really grow and develop and are nurtured, and you're not interested in how early you can teach reading. (That's the greatest fad in America at the present time. If you ask a school system what they're doing, they say, "We're teaching reading in the kindergarten." Then you ask the next question, "What the hell difference does it make?" Nobody thought of that question. They've all read The Ladies' Home Companion which has an article about teaching reading to three year olds; the last paragraph, which nobody reads, says, "Everybody had an I. Q. of 145 or above." I'm waiting for somebody to come along with a system of teaching reading uterally so that we can really get started early.)

Suppose you really carry out what university professors have talked about and don't understand: suppose you really individualized your program in the school so that every kid was on an individual contract and knew what he was doing in the skill-building areas and there actually was a designed plan in operation. Suppose you carried on a social studies program that was not a series of events between wars. (If you ask most people what they teach in U. S. history in the first semester, they will tell you that they teach through the Civil War and the third quarter through World War I or World War II. I have often said, "Well suppose you couldn't teach wars this year? What would you teach? How would you teach history without violence?")

Suppose you eliminated letter grades and said to parents, "We'll give you any kind of a grade you need. If you want a parent conference you can have it. If you need a letter grade we'll give it to you. If you want a number grade we'll give it to you." There is plenty of research on this one, if you need it. Ken McIntire and I did a workshop at Texas Tech. We showed on an overhead screen an essay, and we asked 175 teachers to grade the essay. Then we put the same essay up, but the handwriting was not as good, and asked them to grade it. Then we put a math problem up in which every step in the math problem was wrong but the answer was right; there were fifteen different kinds of errors but the answer was right. Then we gave them a math problem in which the answer was wrong but every step along the way was correct. Then we put a spelling test on the board in which we marked the words that were wrong. (We didn't dare leave it for them to determine.) We marked the four words that were wrong and asked them to give it a grade. Then we said to them, "This girl got the highest grade of any eighth grader in the state of Texas. Now grade them." And of that 175 experienced teachers, every single item had a grade from "A" to "F." We had a beautiful distribution curve on every one of them.

So suppose you get away with change : you set up a high school on a trust model. We have a high school that's been operating on these lines for four years. We established it on the hypothesis that most high schools were irrelevant and really got in the way of learning. And we decided we wanted a high school in which we would not have any rules and regulations except "Behave as best you can," and no dress regulations except "Anything that's clean, neat, and moral." (And by the way, we said to the male staff members, "If you're bothered by a miniskirt, we're worried about you.") We also said we don't want any hall passes, because most communication that goes on in most high schools is, "Have you got a pass?" "Do you really have to go to the John?" All kinds of crud that doesn't make any difference.

We also decided to build the school around a great big library of about eight thousand square feet; every time you walk you run into the library. We also said, "If you want a kid to go someplace, trust him to go there." We also agreed that no faculty meetings would be held that were not open to students. Faculty meetings are held out in the open and students participate in faculty meetings and everything else that goes on prior to them. We also said that some of the combinations of subject matter have been artificial and what you really combined is human beings. So any time teachers want to do something, they are to go ahead and do it; so we have nutty people who teach English, science and art together. And somebody said, "How did they arrive at that?" and I said, "People did." We've been running this school for four years in a suburb of Berkeley into which people have moved from Berkeley, hoping to escape America. And just be sure you know what kind of a community it is, so you know how tough the game is: the West Coast organizer for the John Birch Society lives in our community.

Suppose you really set up an independent study time. Kids are in class too long, and most of the time learning starts when the teacher stops talking. So why don't we have time where kids can mess with what they really want to do? What's going to happen to you in the public schools when you do this?

The local sheriff will come along -- and he usually has high boots -- and he'll say, "Our problem is due to permissiveness in the school." You'll start getting letters to the Board of Education with the copies to the newspapers, some signed, some unsigned. And they'll carry minute little parts of something that, seen as part of a whole continuum, are really not very important. There'll be planned cell meetings before the next board meeting on how they're going to operate in the next meeting -- and by the way, we've had meetings in which there has been a call master, Daley style, who calls the shots as to who's talking next. There'll be a series of telephone calls to the Board, and there'll be telephone calls to the Superintendent, mysterious ones in the middle of the night. I've had it put as nicely as "We're planning to lynch you." It gives one a nice feeling at two in the morning to get such a call. There'll be inspections, or invasions, of classrooms; they'll sit for hours, and they'll pick up one minor point that bothers them. There'll be inspections of libraries. I've had the Minute Men and the Minute Women -- and by the way, they have such righteous looks, like the Daughters of the American Revolution in the painting.

There'll also be an implication that there's some kind of unique sexual activity going on in the schools; I'm always amazed at this one. They see boys and girls who might have an arm around each other and they get real up tight. I don't know what the hell they expect to happen or what their guilt reaction is or whether they recognize what they're no longer capable of, but they'll be very upset. And if one happens to be black and one happens to be white, then you've got a real interesting new game going. We have a black youngster who's dating one of our blonde Caucasian girls. She's a beautiful girl, and it's interesting how many people manage to see those two kids together. They're really very nice kids and are doing well with each other, if the adults will stay out of the way.

Parents will project problems on the schools. We had a man stand up at a board meeting saying, "You've got to run a bus down that area" and when somebody said "Why?" he said "If you don't, my son will put pressure on me to have a car." What he's really saying is "I can't stand that pressure. I have no dialogue with him." In fact one of the parents said to me one night "How come the kids are all on your side?" And I said "I'm not really sure. I guess I'm real. I dialogue with them. They meet in my office." (In fact groups come over. I'm right near one of the high schools and they come over and sit on the floor with me and we talk. They want to know if they can't have a course there, instead of at school.) I told the father that I spend time with them because I like them. He said, "You got to be doing more than that." I said, "I hear you saying to me that the only time you can dialogue with your son is when you're giving him something." He said, "That's exactly right." I said, "Man, you'll never understand. You just aren't going to make it if you don't understand what I'm saying."

Now these are the kinds of things that actually happen out there on the frontier. There are all kinds of strange pressures on teachers and principals and superintendents to conform. And the results are tremendous. One of your complaints might be that we take some people that you[1] have trained very well and then you look at them after two, three, or four years and they've become more like the institution. I think you have a right to wonder what happens out there, and I'm trying to share with you the kinds of pressures that are there.

This is what I try to tell teachers to prevent making conformity happen in a district in which you want to do something different: that in our society, as I see it today, we have many people in the communities who are frightened. They read all this stuff about adolescents, and they're frightened of what they think they might do. Many of the people moving into communities are extremely lonely. They're moving into subdivisions or areas in which they don't know people. Many of them are having difficulty making it with their kids; and if you make it with their kids, they don't like you more, they like you less, unless they're very very sophisticated.

For instance, I can give an example: I had a mother in the other day and she said, "I want my youngster moved to another Junior High School. Can I do it?" I said, "Of course, but could you tell me why so I'd have some idea what's going on?" She said, "My daughter won't talk to me." And I said, "That's not new. What else is bothering you?" She said, "But she goes in and talks to that principal and tells him everything." I said, "Well, he's a responsible guy. He's a pretty good guy. You're lucky. She could be saying it to somebody else that wasn't." But she said, "She talks to him and I don't think he's tough enough on her. He listens to her, so I want her transferred." What she's really saying is, "He's making it with her and that's in my guts and I want it changed."

Many of the people in the communities are truly anti-intellectual. If you've read some of the material on the anti-intellectualism in America, you'll know that it's still going on. Many feel rejected by their own community. They don't understand; for instance, we went through new math and we lost a lot of support from the parents. Then these damn English people come along and give us linguistics with a whole new series and a whole new terminology. Then the social studies people have come along, and the psychologists. We've got a lot of parents who are up tight just in language, let alone in anything else. What can you do?

---

[1] That is, Colleges of Education and of Arts and Science in institutions of Higher Education.

So I'm saying that with the staff in your right hand -- and I use that purposely -- there are some things you have to do. You've got to get the people from your community at the local level, not at the district level, involved in the educational process. In a number of our schools, the teachers sent individual letters to each student before school opened, saying, "I'm looking forward to seeing you and welcoming you. These are the things we're going to do." So if a family had three kids, they got three different letters from each one of the teachers.

Secondly, we have an area in which one of our schools visited every new home that was constructed and occupied this year before school started. The teachers, said, "I'm from the schools and we thought we might be able to be of some help to you." One of our schools had a pre-enrollment of fifth and sixth graders in a middle school and their parents came too. Instead of having back-to-school nights, we're bringing back people in small groups, one quarter of the group each night for four nights, in order to reach the parents that are there. We're saying that since most schools have operated on the negative principle -- they send notification home when something's wrong -- let's reverse the thing; let's never send anything home when something's wrong, but every time a kid does something well let's send something home. So with our right hand, we've got to do some very important things with the community if we're going to make it.

Now, with our left hand, where do we thrust? Where do we go? The usual approaches that have been used have not paid off. One approach we've used traditionally is the 3-R or the fundamentals approach. Every time you get in trouble, somebody says, "Let's teach some more fundamentals." But the 3-R approach just isn't paying off. (By the way, anybody who's still in the argument on how we should teach reading -- for example, should we use a phonetic approach, or should we use a structural analysis, or a kinesthetic approach, or a sight vocabulary -- just doesn't know the research. You have got to use them all. About seventy-five per cent of our kids will learn by a phonetic approach and with twenty-five per cent, we have got to use something else. I've been trying to teach a State Superintendent this in our state, and I can't teach him.)

A second approach that hasn't paid off is the normative approach. Gesell gave us something and we misused it -- the child from one to five, the child from five to ten, ten to fifteen, so that we believed in the "average" kid when there isn't any such kid; he just doesn't exist. For instance, I said to the new teachers, "There are seventy-five of you. The average one of you has had 3.2 years teaching experience, but not a damn one of you has had 3.2 years of teaching experience. There isn't any such thing." We've gone all wrong on this one. For instance, we've developed charts called "scope and sequence," which have held American education back about twenty-five years. Then we came up with a new theory, the "spiral theory"; theoretically you reach an idea at a higher level of conceptual development each time you come back to it. I've looked at fifth, eighth, eleventh, and thirteenth grade American history, and I can't find the spiral. In fact, it may be a downward spiral. We developed courses on this one and it hasn't worked.

The third one that hasn't worked is the thing called "teacher-proof materials." You may be caught in that bag. About three years ago, a number of the national curriculum makers brought a group of us whom they thought knew something about curriculum to Chicago. They said that they had put out these beautiful materials: chem study, chem bond, PSSC, biological study, and so on. We tried them in our own situations. We felt we had teacher-proof material, and then we sent it out to the schools and it got screwed up. We said, "We could have told you that if you had asked us, because there isn't any such thing as teacher-proof materials." In fact I've accused my very good friend John Goodlad of coming up with team-teaching just so that if you put two teachers together, they'd be less likely to screw up teacher-proof materials. It ain't so -- two teachers can do it just as well; in fact, they 'facilitate' each other.

So these approaches haven't worked, in my judgment; and how do I prove they haven't worked? There's increased alienation of kids in our schools, whether they're black or white. There's an increased attack on our schools from both the blacks and the whites. Some of our programs and some of the ones in which Don Bigelow has been involved have not really paid off. Let me give an example. I went up to Anchorage, Alaska, to help him start their Head Start Program. We did a hell of a good job; we trained everybody in sight. We trained teachers, we trained teacher aides, we trained milk dispensers, we trained bus drivers and we really worked our tails off. We pre-tested and post-tested. And there were gains for the kids, in whatever we were measuring. Then we sent them into the first grade of the school (in Anchorage, first grade is original kindergarten). By the end of the first grade you couldn't find the gains. The gains were gone and as a result, the U. S. Office has come up with the program of Follow Through. My hunch is that Follow Through is not going to work because both this one and Head Start are based on the same idea -- that of fixing kids (the idea is the school's fault, not the U.S. Office's fault). How do we fix kids so they fit into our particular system?

My point of view is that the repair syndrome won't work. You can't add another little course and repair the situation; you can't say, "Well we're going to teach black history because we hate kids." These won't work. I think there has to be a real reconstruction of the schools. Now I think our problem when we start to talk about reconstruction is that we've been working on some false premises, and I think that the colleges have given us some of these false premises.

One is that the people honestly resist learning, growing, and development and that you really have got to motivate people to learn, which means you 'induce' something into them. Periodically I teach at the graduate school at San Francisco State and at California. When kids come into my classes, which are advanced curriculum classes, I have lots of material around, lots of things, and I say, "Here's some material in regard to the field. I'm available over here in the corner. Why don't you mess around with it for a week or so and decide what you're going to do?" It's amazing what happens, you have probably had the experience. Within a couple of days they're saying to me, "What do you want me to do?" I say, "I don't want you to do anything. I'm going to be a superintendent when this is all over. What are you going to be?" They're hurt for awhile; also, I add one more dimension. I say, "I don't care about grades. You'll get a 'B' or an 'A' in the class, whatever you need. Tell me what you need and I'll feed you, but you must decide." Once they begin to believe, they work their tails off because they honestly want to learn and want to grow, despite what's happened to them. I don't believe that people resist learning and growing and developing. I think we've done that to them and once we relieve them of that, they want to learn.

Secondly, people are capable of learning on their own and we don't really believe that. If somebody would say to me "Do we have to work in here?" I'd say "I don't care where you work. The University is a big place. The community is a big place. I don't care where you do your work. I trust you. You're going to work your tail off. Go ahead and do it."

Third, if they're left alone and especially if they're young, then anarchy will exist. We've got some people who have interpreted the law which says, "You have to have reasonable supervision of kids," as "You've got to be able to see them." They won't even let them get outside their room or out in the gardens or whatever the case may happen to be, because they just have that feeling that Mother has to hover over them, or Father.

Fourth, that education means how much information you possess. Most teachers look like encyclopedias in poor form because some of the answers aren't right.

The fifth and the last is we've got an idea that the purpose of education is to fit people to this world, in other words, how to live in an affluent society. I'm coming up with a hypothesis, just for you to think about, that the more affluent the culture is, the more dehumanized it is. I have much more success in getting interaction when working with communities that are less affluent than when working with the more affluent communities; I'm coming to the conclusion that education, as it is now given out, is a dehumanizing process. We are saying to kids "How can we teach you to adjust to a cold war?" There's an assumption there that it is inevitable; we are accepting it but the kids aren't buying it. We are saying, too, "How do we adjust you to a cybernetic IBM world?" I don't think we ought to be teaching in that direction at all, but I see it going on. Given our affluence, what can teachers do? As I see it, teachers are going to have to become the intellectuals of the community. They've got to read and think and plan and know and analyze both as individuals and groups, whatever the situation is.

In addition to this, I think the major reforms, if we're going to make it in the schools are going to have to be in the affective domain rather than the cognitive domain. I think the first essential is that teachers be human beings and be congruous, so that they're giving off honest messages with kids. And they're not going to be able to give off honest messages with kids unless they have received honest messages from somebody in their teaching career. I get teachers coming out of your institutions who ask me this question: "When I start to teach, should I start tough and get easy or should I start easy and get tough?" I always say, "Why don't you start? Why don't you be you?" There's something that has been taught to us: if the real you were known, you wouldn't be liked. So we play all kinds of games.

Another point is that a good teacher is one the students can trust. I don't know what goes on at the universities, whether you teach this or not, but I've held to the contention that most teacher-rooms are immoral. Listen to the conversation that goes on; part of it's anti-intellectual; for example, "Where did you get that new dress" or "Gee, your hair looks nice." All the stuff that doesn't count. Then the conversation goes to, "Did you get Johnny Smith this year? Man, you're in for trouble. I had his two brothers and they weren't any good either." -- and all kinds of conversation that ought not to be going on because it violates trust. Kids test us as you test each other: whether you can be trusted with information.

In my judgment, teachers also need knowledge and experience. I don't know any way to have any knowledge and experience besides having knowledge and experience. One of the things that I think universities need to provide young people coming out to teach with is broad kinds of experiences for them, so they have something to share with youngsters.

I think too, that a teacher has somehow got to be hep to the language of students. My son is nineteen; when he came home at the age of about sixteen and said to me one day "You know I sure made out on that date" I had to take a second thought, because "making out" on a date in my connotation had a different kind of a meaning than for sixteen-year-old of today. Had I responded quickly, I would have made a number of the mistakes that many adults make. I just waited though, to hear what he really had to say and he said, "She was beautiful and it was fun." That's all it was, but I had to pick up that language quickly.

Another thing that I think is important is that so very few times in teaching, when a kid says something in the classroom, do I hear teachers say "Hey man, that was just beautiful. You know, that was the greatest thing I've heard in my life. You're just wonderful," without adding a "but." Most teachers want to put a "but" in and elaborate on it and turn it into an intellectual pursuit. I see very little being done to show honest affection for kids.

All right, now, if you do some of the things that I'm talking about, what might happen to schools? They might decide that they have a responsibility to have some educational goals that they're aiming at: they might decide that "rational man" is the goal; they might set up a school that has more options for kids; they might want to teach a true democratic society in it; they might want to see kids as culture carriers. Somehow or other the school has got to have some goals.

What might happen then is that they might be able to ask the next question: "If these are our goals, what's our instructional hypothesis?" How do we help kids move from knowledge and skill to concepts and the kinds of behavior that we're aiming at? (The reason we keep giving tests about knowledges and skills is it's the simplest place to be. Learning is a change of behavior as a result of experience. When you start asking questions such as, "What behaviors have you changed at your university or at the public school?", then nobody wants to talk.)

Another thing that might happen is we might honestly create in the schools an open society where people engage with each other without shoulder bars; where principals and teachers and superintendents and kids live together in a humane sort of a way -- a society where ideas have a higher priority than titles. Most schools are closed societies; most schools are organized with the same syndrome as businesses, armies, and universities. The syndrome operates on these lines: board of education, superintendent, assistant superintendent, principal, teachers. On most charts I look at, kids don't even make the chart; they're not even in the game. So maybe a school could become a kind of open place. People say to me, "Aren't you worried the way you behave that teachers will forget you're the superintendent?" I say, "Man, that's not my problem. My problem is to get them to forget that I'm the superintendent so they use their own intelligence."

If we do some of these things, teachers will become responsible for their own growth patterns, and this will mean then that you will have all kinds of interesting things going on in the district: kids will be free and teachers will be free to 'engage' them as they need to, without anyone's ever saying, "I need so many in-service points," or "This is a required meeting." I spent my life as a teacher figuring out how to get out of required meetings. The minute I was told that it was a required meeting, something in me went up and said, "How do I work it? There's got to be a game somewhere where I can get out of this sort of thing, because if it's required it can't be very good."

Teachers will also be responsible for their own evaluations. What I'm saying to teachers is that nobody can evaluate them. Usually when I watch people who do that kind of evaluation, they look up before they decide to make the evaluation, as though they're getting a message from some place else. Oliver Wendell Holmes made a comment, "I wish these damn mystics with pipelines to heaven would have them disconnected." Nobody's getting any messages from any place else.

Now how can people improve themselves? I'm suggesting with teachers, "Why don't you tape an hour of your class? Take it home and listen to it. Have a good friend you can talk to the next day, because it's painful. If you get real good at it, video tape one of your hours. Have an automatic eraser on the video tape so that you can erase it after it's over."

My 'reconstructed model' represents a real change for the public schools. However, my hunch is that if we don't make these changes, the alternative is rebellion on the part of the students. We're seeing that rebellion in many schools at the present time and most of the schools in which I see rebellion deserve it.

Now how does this all relate to what I might say to you?[1] Well, I'm not going to tell you what to do in teacher education because you wouldn't do it. Let me just ask a half a dozen questions and quit. Do you really want to deal co-operatively and democratically with schools in the community? You've never done it. If you've done it uniquely in your place, please send me an invitation, because I don't believe you. I've sat in those meetings and I've watched the heirarchy begin to work. Do you want to get messed up in that school situation that's really rough? Do you really want to start getting those telephone calls in the middle of the night? And do you really want to get that messy, with some parents saying, "What are you doing to my kid with this new thing that you're doing?" (It's been awfully nice to be a consultant; that's the guy that can run away when the danger gets tough. I do it all the time. I understand it well.) Do you really want to get that messed up? If you don't, let's quit playing games. Let's be honest. Can you recognize that most of what is going on in teacher education and in the academic areas related to teacher education is handicapping teachers to deal effectively with kids in the classroom? Are you really willing to analyze experiences in a way which will be meaningful? How do you get kids really committed to want to do something, and how do you look at what you yourself are doing? Certainly another course in the history of American education won't do it. Can you really operate in an open society? Can you come into a school without saying I'm Doctor so and so and I hold a degree from such and such a place, but actually take your shirt off and your tie off and get in there and dig with kids? Do you have a strategy so that, if you set up a new approach in a school, you can make it work with the staff? And then if the strategy works, do you have any kind of a strategy to move it to some other places? One of the things I'm seeing over America is that when somebody does something nice over there and it looks interesting, nothing happens. It doesn't move any place. The walls of the next district are very tough. Do you have any strategy?

Can you honestly relate with fourteen year olds or fifteen year olds or nine year olds in the classroom? I taught last summer at Jackson State College. And the only way I really made it with the black teachers is by going over to the demonstration school and starting to work with fifth graders. And when the fifth graders could take me, they did an interesting thing which you ought to know about; some of you who are black will understand it. After the first day, the first thing they wanted to do was to come over and touch my skin. They ran their hands up and down my skin to see what it felt like. But once the kids started to make it with me, I started to make it with the teachers. Can you really operate in that kind of a society, and do you really want to? Do you have a learning or behavioral strategy that you're trying to get across? I could really go on for a long time on these.

---

[1] "You" here refers to institutions of and professors and administrators in Higher Education (Ed. note).

Now, what have I tried to do in this talk? Just very simply to tell you, "It's a tough world out there." I think it's about time that those of you who are working at the colleges and universities decide, "Yeah, that is a tough world and I think I'll stay out. I think I'll teach another graduate course this year. I've gotten by for a number of years. I've only got five years left to retirement. I probably could make it the rest of the way out. But if I'm going to come in, I'm going to come in real and honest and unphony and find out what it's all about and be perfectly willing to say to a first grade teacher, 'I don't know how to do that; will you help me? Maybe I have something I can help you with, but I don't understand what you're doing. Help me would you please?'"

Now in conclusion, what can I say? If you're smart, you'll forget everything I said; if any of these things are not familiar to you and you decide to get into it, you're going to live a very anxious life, because it's going to be painful. You'll wake up in the morning wondering whether you can go to work that day and know enough, because once you open up the door and people begin to ask questions, your university degree won't help you.

Response to Dick Foster
I Speak in Parables: Your Child Is a Reproach

Mr. Ernest Chambers
The Omaha Black Community

Mr. Ernest Chambers is slightly over thirty years old. He received an undergraduate degree at Creighton University, attended law school; and, encountering American racism in and out of Higher Education, quit to become a barber in the Omaha ghetto and to do another kind of job of education for white and black America. Mr. Chambers, in A Time for Burning, spoke of racism in American religion. He offered, before the Kerner committee, eloquent testimony concerning what our cities have become and why (published in the April, 1968, issue of Ebony magazine):

> . . . we have marched, we have cried, we have prayed, we have voted, we have petitioned, we have been good little boys and girls. We have gone out to Vietnam as doves and came back as hawks. We have done every possible thing to make this white man recognize us as human beings. And he refuses. . . . You all know what colonialism is. We know what it is in fact, in America as black people. . . . Any vestige of a culture, religion or language, you took away from us.

Mr. Chambers' Kerner report testimony goes on to show what this colonialism has been in education, housing, and police work in Omaha.

Mr. Chambers' remarks at the Minneapolis conference were extempore remarks, given as a response to Mr. Foster's speech.

Mr. Chambers' interest is in America's schools as a product of traditional American "colonialism" and in the school's presentation of great American "colonialist" heroes, men who at best played a highly ambiguous game for freedom, sacrificing black people to ease. Chambers is interested in the way in which our failure to come to terms with history and history's guilt creates the defensive, insecure and oppressive communities which Mr. Foster describes, the school systems and teachers which mirror such communities. Some of Mr. Chambers' remarks concerning historical matters may be followed up in The American Heritage History of the Presidents and in John Hope Franklin's various histories of the interaction of black and white in America.

It should be observed that, during the period in which the Minneapolis conference was being conducted, Mr. Chambers was running for the Omaha school board. He was defeated.

I Speak in Parables: "Your Child Is A Reproach"

Mr. Ernest Chambers
Omaha Black Community

I enjoy a chance to speak to a group like this, because I'm the descendant of a slave and you're the descendants of the slave holders and your ancestors have taught you that I can't understand the kind of learning and knowledge that you have to offer, but I understand it very well. And I can see why your ancestors could degenerate to a level where they would acknowledge property in a human being, a black human being. And I see this tradition carried over into your attitudes today and in the school system. And the reason there are inferior schools in the ghetto is because you don't view black people as human beings. We see ourselves as people and as human beings.

By the way, Dick Foster's talk was fairly decent for a talk from a white man, and I noticed a lot of you were reacting very well to it. He managed to establish communication with you on a human level and I think that he raised you above the level which you generally operate on, because if there were as many human beings in education as seemed to be human while he was talking, the problems of education would be on the way to solution. But you are the weak, spineless, anemic, empty, frightened individuals that he was describing at certain points. You're all of those things because you've come here, and a nice talk and eloquent words will move you and you'll respond to these things. But you don't have sense enough to project from this and understand that children would respond in the same way to human treatment. You are not a human being and you don't know how to treat anybody like a human being, and that's why you fail. And if the shoe doesn't fit you won't wear it. And if the shoe does fit, you're not going to wear it. Because white people to me are in fact the scum of the earth.

And you know why some of you like to hear me say this. Because you think about your neighbor or you think about some other white person you don't like and you say that really fits him or her. So you're backing up what I say. Don't call me a racist in reverse when I tell you how despicable you are, because George Wallace throughout his campaign is telling the whole country and the whole world the same thing. He acknowledges that he is a racist; he doesn't deny that he hates black people; and yet he says, 'On this basis of known and acknowledged racism, I'm appealing to the white American public, ' and he had a crowd in Kansas City of ten thousand enthusiastic white Christian Americans, the same kind of people who would hold slaves today if they had the opportunity or thought we would submit to it.

There are a lot of us who are going to get wiped out and not have a chance to see our children grow up. And a lot of white people look at every black man with whiskers and long hair or a desire to change the condition under which our children are being brought up as a revolutionary. They can never view him in a family setting, where he likes to go home in the evening and eat the meal that his wife has prepared and tell her, "Let the crackers thank God for it in their phony way, I'm thanking you for it. You placed this meal on the table;" where he likes to look at his small son and have his son look at him and say, "I want to be like you. Not like that cracker George Washington they tell me about in school who wore powdered white wigs, who made bastards on black women he held as property, and who carried on a relationship with his half-brother's wife throughout his entire life."

George Washington, the father of your country: my boy doesn't want to be like him and he knows he was a racist; he knows he was a criminal; and he knows he was a scoundrel. And I tell him that in these days when white people are trying to pretend to be more enlightened, they've announced the sentence that ought to be passed on a man like George Washington -- a man stealer, a whoremonger, an adulterer, and a maker of bastards. That's what George Washington, the father of your country, was.

The same thing is true about Thomas Jefferson. We have a historian here; you can get it from him if you don't want to accept it from me. He had nine favorite black women on whom he fathered children, little bastards. Thomas Jefferson -- another great one who talked about the right of every man to be free because God created every man the same, who said that from this same creation we have to have the same rights -- he was holding black people as slaves. Nine favorite black women, and he was making babies and his wife said, "Thomas, leave those women alone." And Mr. Jefferson, acknowledging how beautiful the black sister is, how much soul she has -- like this man said how 'humanized' we are -- he said, "Mrs. Jefferson, I'll leave you alone first." And he continued making his little bastards. But then when he decided to assume the role of the pious hypocrite, like a lot of you are going to do, he said, "Slavery is a terrible thing, degrading submission on the one hand, terrible despotism on the other, and our children observe this and they imitate it." And then he went on to tell other terrible things and he said, "I tremble for my country when I remember that God is just and that his justice cannot sleep forever."

But he did not tremble enough to free his slaves. How can a man make me think that God means anything to him, when in one breath he can acknowledge the existence of God and His justice, the right of every man to be free, and yet hold slaves. You all lied to us in school;

Thomas Jefferson wasn't talking about all men. He was talking about white Americans, as opposed to white Britishers, and saying that white Americans in America had as many rights under the British constitution as white people in Britain. He's proved that he didn't mean all people, by holding slaves.

And you like to talk about representative government as though it was founded in a 'great English tradition.' England had a parliament, but its parliament was not representative. The rotten borough system of men who represented nobody originated in England. Men from the West Indies purchased seats in the house of parliament, and they caused the price of the seats to go up because the West Indian planters were so wealthy, thanks to the slave trade, the trade in black human beings. It was through the trade of black human beings that England and France got enough capital to become capitalist countries and have an industrial revolution. They got enough money to make money from money, from the utilization and sale of my people; then I'm supposed to sit up here and say that white people are all right and teach my child that he should worship a slave-holding whoremonger?

And Patrick Henry: why is it that the men who talked like they had the greatest moral sensitivity could hold slaves? He also said, "Is peace so precious or life so dear as to be bought with chains and slavery? I know not what course others may take [and I don't believe he said this, I believe he's a liar because a man who holds slaves couldn't have this sensitivity] I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death." Freedom meant so much to him that he would take death rather than enslavement, and Patrick Henry held slaves. And he said, "I know it's wrong but I'll pay my debt to virtue to this extent. I'll acknowledge that it's wrong, but I'm carried along by the practice in the community and the general inconvenience of living without them." The inconvenience of living without slaves justified this man in holding slaves. You've got a whole lot to do about your self-image, and about how this country was established -- and notice I'm saying this in front of a historian.

Again I'm going to say Mr. Foster gave a good talk. I noticed how you were basking in his sophistication. But there were not enough amens from you. There were a lot of things he said which you didn't pick up. There were times maybe he didn't intend to when he was talking down to you. And I don't think you had sense enough to recognize it. There were times you laughed, and you were the joke. You were the object of the joke and you laughed at yourself without having sense enough to know it. That's why the white people who want to sell you products will take a British man like Arthur Treacher, who plays the role of a butler, and have him advertising products -- because you recognize your peasant and criminal origins in this country. You feel every

European is an aristocrat and you are a peasant and you are inferior to him, so you bow down before a foreign accent. You want the British to say your movies are great, that your literature is out of sight, that your style of furniture or architecture is finally what's happening. When you have a British say you are all right then you feel all right. The doors of Newgate Prison were opened and thugs and cutthroats and sneakthieves were allowed to come over here and populate this country. Mr. Foster can tell you that in Jamestown, the white people tried to start a colony in 1607. They tried to grow corn, unsuccessfully. They tried to produce wine, unsuccessfully. They tried to produce silk, unsuccessfully. They tried to mine gold, unsuccessfully. The British Home Office even reorganized the government and it still didn't do any good. So in 1619 some black people came to this country, and they came here not as 'slaves' but as 'teachers.' And the white people were dying like flies. Gilbert and Raleigh tried to establish colonies and one disappeared without a trace -- they called it the Lost Colony of Virginia. That's in your American history. For twelve years these people stumbled along and died like flies without even knowing why they died. But like the gingham dog and the calico cat who ate each other up, these thieves and cutthroats, there were so many of them in proportion to the working population that they didn't have enough people to live off of, were consuming each other and dying.

So these black people, familiar with the kind of terrain where these ignorant white people settled, told them, "Do you want to live?" They said, "Everybody wants to live." "You really want to stop dying?" "Everybody wants to stop dying." "Then, man, you settled in a swamp and in swamps there are mosquitoes and mosquitoes give malaria and that's why you're dying; so if you want to live get out of the swamp." And the white people moved to higher ground in Jamestown and they stopped dying. The black man taught them how to hunt and fish and live off of the land and just five years later after everything the colonists tried failed, after everything the foreign office in Britain tried failed, five years after the black men came here, the colony stabilized and was made a royal colony in 1624. And that is in American history. You will give an account of all the failures of the colonies and then you'll jump without an explanation of why there was a change of state: "Magically it stabilized and things began to happen."

I didn't intend to say all of this. But I look at all of these white people. How complacent you are; how smug you are. You think you've got the world by the tail because we're sitting in a room right here where everybody is nice. But everybody around the world hates you. You're considered the ugly American. And the movie The Ugly American was made by white people about white people. You're hated in Vietnam. When there was a strike of the taxi drivers, the strike was against white American soldiers, not against black American soldiers.

It was against the ugly white American, the same ugly white man who went into Hawaii and overthrew the queen and took her land, who went into the Philippines to free them from the Spanish oppressors and then the Filipinos had to launch guerilla warfare to get their country back, against the same kind of white people who like to draw a line across Vietnam on a map and say it's now two countries; draw a line around various parts of Africa and say these are different countries. But why, if you like lines, don't you do something about acknowledging the existence of the wall in Berlin as a legitimate exercise of Russian Power? And if you don't like the wall, why don't you tear the wall down in Germany? Why don't you go on into Czechoslovakia and save the white people whom you indicated were being unjustly treated? Because you are vicious and cowardly people. As Malcolm X said, "Brave when you got bombs, brave when you got tanks, brave when you got napalm, brave when you have a lot of company along with you. But when it comes time to face a man who has the same thing that you've got, then you are not a man." And you know this and your history bears it out.

The British were pressing your pants during the Revolutionary War and George Washington didn't want black men in the army. So the British started using black men, and Indians too, and promised the black slaves freedom if they'd fight for the British. And they were pressing George Washington's pants. He became what's known as a master of retreat. Any meeting of consequence that he had with the British resulted in him retreating. And he was stepping fast, fast, fast across New Jersey being pursued hotly by the British when Tom Paine said, "These are the times that try men's souls." And the same Tom Paine who knew George Washington, the father of your country and all the black people named Washington, said, "Treacherous in private friendship, hypocritical in public life, I don't know if you're a man who lost all principle or if you never had any."

Discussion of Mr. Chambers' Speech

Dan Goodwin: I can only add amen to everything he said.

Mr. Foster: Don't go away. Let me just ask one question. I want to make it with you. I'm perfectly willing to agree, as I have, that I'm the executioner. I came out of that. I need to study myself as a representation of the white man. But how do I make it if I am different from your stereotype? How do I get you to evaluate me different from the whole syndrome if I do do something with myself?

Mr. Chambers: Just like you did this morning. You talk to me like a man and I'll treat you like a man. I judge every man according to the way he treats me. And he cannot treat me better than I'll treat him.

Mr. Foster: I did the first desegregation of a school district in California. I'm the senior consultant on Sausalito. The first thing I did as I went into the black community with friends that I had was to say, "Come on, are you with me?" The first question they asked me was, "Do you have any strings on you?" And I said, "I never have any strings." And as a result we met the same way as you and I are meeting at the same time, man to man. How do we teach people who haven't had that kind of experience how to get that kind of experience?

Mr. Chambers: You have to teach them that they are not human, that they have robbed their own till and cheated themselves, and as long as they occupy the position they're in and maintain the attitudes they have, they can never learn and there can never be any communication because words are not enough.

Mr. Foster: How are you working in your home with your kids to teach them to be able to discriminate between the whites that fall into your picture and the whites who are making their way out of the execution?

Mr. Chambers: I tell them that it's like rabbits and foxes. All foxes eat all rabbits. And I tell my son that I would be lying to him if I told him he could go out in that world and be treated like any child ought to be treated. I tell him there is an entire group of people out there and they're white. And I tell him, "They hate you." And he watches television and he sees this being demonstrated like in Mississippi where grown men attack little black children with ax handles and tire irons and break their legs. And I say, "If you were there, they would do that to you."

Mr. Foster: What if he meets me and I'm real? How does he deal with me?

Mr. Chambers: It's up to you to show him that you don't fit into the category that I established.

Mr. Foster: Okay. Beautiful. [To the audience] Do you want to ask anything? This is a real man and I know exactly what he's saying and I hear him. If you don't hear him, you better ask some questions. The kind of thing that you're going to say in your room tonight isn't going to help you. It's now you got to ask the question, if you care, "What do I do with myself?"

By the way, stop studying the blacks. Quit studying black people, because they're not the problem. We're the problem. Study us. What makes a man like Wallace be able to attract twenty per cent of the people to want to vote for him when he gives out nothing but crap? Now, we got to study us and decide, where have we come? What's happened to us? Now I'm not willing to accept all the responsibilities for Washington. But I'm damn well willing to change myself. And by the way, there isn't much of this I hear in teacher education, and I don't hear much of it in any schools.

Participant: How do we reach a point where we can communicate with you enough so that we can have enough insight and understanding so that we can go back to the white community and maybe make a dent?

Mr. Chambers: In case some of you didn't hear the question he asked, I assume he means if there are any white people who are really interested in trying to solve the problem how can they communicate with me and people like me enough to get some insights to go back into the white community and spread the gospel there. I imagine that's what he's asking.

Like I told this gentleman, if you show yourself to be a person, we deal with you on that basis. And you can make a lot of mistakes. But no man comes into life knowing everything. This man didn't pop into existence knowing all he knows now. It's a result of study, and experience, and observation, and analysis, and drawing of conclusions based on the realities he's observed. But Foster made mistakes. He went on false trails and that's what you're going to do too. But see, we're not opposed to a man making a mistake, because I make mistakes too. But when you're making your mistake, while you're struggling to find out what the truth is, we can buy this and accept it and understand it. But we have to see something in you -- and we read people like we read books -- that shows us that you are a person and your genuine aim is to try to help solve the problem.

Then problems of communication with words, or a reference you might make to me which I don't like, can be explained and we can work all around that, because that's not the primary issue anymore. We're trying to overcome a lot of misunderstandings so that you can take something back from us to your own people. Come to us like a person and we'll give you all the insight we're capable of imparting and which you can receive. And from there on it's up to you to take it back.

But here's what I'd like to say. This man might be very sincere. But why is it that, when all of you came into the world none of you knew anything? You decided you were going to be teachers or whatever you're going to be. And after taking a prescribed amount of study, then you knew enough to be that. Well, you were born as a human being so you shouldn't need any instruction in how to be human. If you view me as a human being, then you know what my problems are and how you can help solve them, because you'd know how to solve the problem if it was yours.

(You know about a Marshall Plan in Europe. You can see -- and this shows the hypocrisy -- you're going to send food to starving black people in Biafra, but when black, brown, red, and poor white people approached this humane government in Washington because they had hungry children with distended bellies, they went to jail. This is what you have to understand: that we view the split and the double standard and the hypocrisy, actions which you say are for a right cause, but we know they're not because you're not consistent all the way down the line. Charity abroad, oppression at home, that's what we're sick of.)

Mr. Foster is not personally responsible for George Washington, but he's responsible if he doesn't break down the old mythology of George Washington, that sham semi-God status that he holds, and put him in his proper perspective and let young white people know that the hero for them is not this powder-wigged, military-uniform-wearing individual. Like he says, stop romanticizing men who the only thing they did was fought wars. Wars don't humanize people. He can do away with this mythology. Then once we see the roots of America and whence this country came, you can understand the deep bedrock of criminality throughout the society and why men with G. E. and Westinghouse, Upjohn Drug Company can fix prices, U.S. Steel can fix prices, and nothing is considered bad about that. Embezzlers can clip banks for multimillions of dollars and nothing is bad about that. It's because this is a country with a criminal mentality, because it started in criminality. It started with a denial of the principles on which it was established -- freedom and recognition of human dignity while holding slaves. There has always been a split and a division.

Johnson doesn't have to set up a commission to study violence, to study crime, because he is the violent man, maintaining a war at a cost of four hundred lives a week, twenty-seven thousand over all, and about thirty-two billion dollars a year. He doesn't have to study crime because he's the criminal. His buddy is Bobby Baker who's been convicted of theft, fraud, income tax evasion, and perjury, and won't spend a day in jail. His friend is J. Edgar Hoover, who has never married, who wants to rule on the qualifications of the young woman any of his agents is going to marry, who last summer fired a young agent because he spent the night with his girl friend. Those are Lyndon Johnson's friends.

Now here's what I say: you all are responsible for Lyndon Johnson. After all of the years and generations of your religion, your educational institutions, your quasi- or semi- or pseudo-philosophy of Americana, Lyndon Johnson is the product. That's your prize product. That's the best you produce and you hold him up to the world as the best that you have to offer; and his successor is George Wallace.

And they descend in a direct line from thugs like Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, James Madison, Zachary Taylor, Ulysses S. Grant. Read about them, and don't condemn me because I tell you what they were. If Jesse James robbed a bank and I told the sheriff, "Jesse James robbed the bank," who are you going to get? Me, who alerts the sheriff to what Jesse did, or Jesse who robbed the bank? George held the slaves, not me.

And I think all of you are responsible when you don't do anything to overcome the attitude generated by these past offenses committed against us. The tradition of slavery is still here. There's some of you who are letting metal shields slide across your mind and you don't hear anything. There are those who say, "Guys like him drive away the friends of black people." You never were a friend of black people and the sooner you're weeded out the better. The sooner you can drop that hypocritical phony front of being for everybody, the better off we are, because I feel that every white man is my enemy. Every one; that's what I said. Now you know, when you're talking to a mixed audience like this, with different levels of education and misunderstanding, you have to use broad general statements which the ones with true understanding will understand. And that's what your leader Jesus used to do. He said, 'I speak in parables so that hearing, they will hear and not understand, seeing they will see and not perceive.' The ones for whom it's intended will understand.

And just one other thing. Somebody mentioned the three R's. Malcolm X said that if we can't have freedom together, then nobody is going to have it. There's going to be mutual sharing or mutual despairing.

So maybe for you the three R's are reading, writing, and arithmetic, but because we've been deprived so long and we see that there is no genuine attempt to overcome this deprivation and bring about a rule of justice, the three R's for us young black men are: 'This is ours, that's ours, everything is ours.' And the only way you can get something and make it yours when a man doesn't want to let it go is to take it. And you can like it or not. That's the kind of world you live in.

You're getting your rear end kicked all over the world right now anyway. I'm glad to see you depleting your armed forces by having five hundred thousand young men in Vietnam. And then you're talking about peace and the threat of communism. But the communists don't have five hundred thousand men on somebody else's soil. They didn't liberate Vietnam by dropping napalm on women and children. They didn't liberate Czechoslovakia by shooting eighty-year-old women and three-year-old children and calling them the enemy. No. I see it as all the same. Russia and America are co-conspirators, but I think America is worse than Russia because the reason there is not peace in the world today is not because of Russia or Red China but because of the United States of America. There is a brutalization of all the civilizations in the world, all the people in the world, because of the war in Vietnam. And this is being maintained by the United States of America. And your young white people are standing up and saying, "I'm not going to go fight this war." They're not dumb like you are.

This jive about 'my country right or wrong:' you identify whatever political party's in office with your country, and it says, "Go fight, dummy." You say, "I don't know what I'm fighting for." It says, "Go fight anyway: the flag, the Daughters of American Revolution, and motherhood and all these other simple things." You have tears come in your eyes when they talk to you about it. You ran on off and fought for something you didn't even understand.

Your child has more sense than you, and that's why he's a reproach and that's why -- as Foster said -- when he speaks to you, you drop your eyes and you can't look him in the face because he's a man as a child and you're not a man now. And you know you're not a man and you can't be a man; you've got strings on you: you're scared of your boss; you're scared in the daytime; you're scared at night; you're scared of the living; you're scared of the dead; you're scared when the weather's good because it might get bad; you're scared when it's bad because you might get struck by lightning. You're motivated by fear.

Participant: Most of this is bullshit!

Mr. Chambers: Well, that's fine. You think whatever you want to think. I want this man to have a chance to speak and I want every one of you to listen to him. Go ahead and speak. You have a right to speak.

Participant: I thought that we were going to have a rational discussion on the issues relating to the area of elementary education. It's quite apparent that you've come to give a speech and we've listened to your hostility and I've listened very carefully. It's not a new speech; we've heard this story before, I think. I'm trying very hard to be sympathetic to the kinds of things that people like you perhaps have experienced that have led you to reach this position. But to stand here and have one confrontation after another while everybody stands up and vents his hostility seems to me to be not the purpose of the conference. Now if that's what we're going to have, a series of encounters, then let's get on with the encounters. Let's let everybody vent his hostility on everybody else. I don't think that's the purpose of the meeting and therefore, I'm going to register a protest to the way this whole thing's going. I don't think that's what we're about. And I think a good share of what you've been saying -- if the purpose is to let us see what you think, then fine, I see it -- but I think a good share of what you've said is crap.

Mr. Chambers: I'm going to let you speak immediately. You say you felt you came here for a rational discussion of the issues. Do you feel that your outburst was rational?

Participant: No.

Mr. Chambers: Are you a teacher?

Participant: Yes, I am.

Mr. Chambers: Do you ever react this way in the classroom to things you don't like?

Participant: I would react if this is the kind of dialogue we're going to have.

Mr. Chambers: You know what? I think that a teacher of all people should be able to learn from every situation. If you can't take every situation you're exposed to and derive some learning value from it, you're not a teacher and you shouldn't be in the classroom. I think your outburst was good because through you breaking out like that you relieved the tension of a lot of other white people in here. I know you better than you know me. You don't disturb me by implying that what I say is irrational. I know that you have no arguments against what has happened in America, against black people and others so you have to react in the way you do. I sympathize with you more than you do me because I'm in a position where I can sympathize with you. You can't sympathize with me because there is nothing you can give to me. But there's a young man back here who has something he'd like to say.

Mr. Joseph Stroman [college student from N.Y.U.]: Relating your fears to education: you are met with the man who has ideas, many of which are very common among the students whom you are teaching. If you cannot understand or attempt to understand why these feelings come out, why they are present, I doubt that you'll be able to get anything across as far as education is concerned. These ideas are here, they're here now, especially with your young people. Kids sixteen, seventeen, fifteen, and fourteen are thinking about the world situation and the United States. And all these things are present in your classroom. I intend to be a teacher also. We have to understand these ideas in order to have communication and dialogue.

Mr. Foster: Let me just play one minor role. I think that what I heard this morning from the gentleman on my right I hear from all kids in different forms. I heard it in one form today because this man has had more reason to have been hurt. But I hear it from every kid that I work with in depth, saying it in his own form; and just because you're hearing it today from a black man who sees himself as angry and militant, if you listen to the white kid in the ghetto or the suburb and listen long enough, he may say it to you in different words, but at least the ones I'm dialoguing with are saying the same thing to me in their way. And I think that what you listened to this morning you ought to hear two ways. One: you hear it as a part of the feeling of black America today. But secondly: you had better hear it as the speech of all white kids who have any understanding of what's going on because they're saying it in their way.

Now you may not like the way it comes. I think that's irrelevant, how it comes. I don't care how it's said. I'm trying to hear the overtones and the undertones that get in my guts so I know how to perform as a human being. Don't let the melody carry you away. Get a feeling; get an understanding of what's being communicated because that's the only way we can be teachers. Otherwise, we have nothing really to give America at the present time.

With that I'm going to kick you [Mr. Chambers] off because I like you enough to be able to kick you off. I'm not worried about what your response will be because I'm honest with you. You've had your say. If you take longer you'll spoil it. You'll say too goddamn much. And you're in good shape right now.

Mr. Ernest Chambers
Discussion: The Omaha Black Community

The following small group discussion was conducted across the next couple of days after the Foster-Chambers interchange. The discussion was interrupted by speeches which appear later in the book, and to some degree was influenced by their themes. However, most of it was an organic development from the Foster-Chambers interchange. Hence, it is placed here. The few references which are made in this discussion to speeches which appear later in the book do not generally require clarification. The background for some of the discussion may be gained by some general consulting the speeches referred to: those by Anthony Gibbs and Louise Bufford, by John Dick and Alice Neundorf, by Sue Easterling, and by Dan Griffiths and Ernest Morial.

GROUP DISCUSSION

Resource Persons:
Mr. Ernest Chambers and Mr. Dan Goodwin, Omaha
Chairman: Sophia Nelson

Participant: I'm glad that I heard what I heard from Mr. Chambers. I'm not accustomed to hearing it. But like many of us, I hate to be lumped together with all those bad whites. I'm not a descendant of slave holders; I resent the over-generalizations. I'm appreciative of knowing that these ideas are prevalent, but I don't know what I'm going to do with them now.

Chairman: Well, may I suggest it might be a good idea to try to put your perfectly normal resentments of being "lumped" aside for the time being and do a whole lot more listening than you've ever done before in your life. We, of course, have been stereotyped and categorized negatively all our lives. We don't like it either. It's new for you; goody, goody.

You're not going to find many people like Chambers, so you won't have this experience often; nor are you going to find many people like me. There are four black people in my group at Nebraska, and probably I'm the only one that's going to get cornered very easily, to talk very frankly on these subjects, because I'm ready. But increasingly we are not ready to talk to you any more. So grab your opportunities to talk with the few black people who can and will tell you frankly, because they're going to be too few.

Participant: What do you mean when you say you're "increasingly not ready to talk?" Maybe we're not ready, but it seems to me that you are ready.

Chairman: We were. We were. This is a very good question, and I think there's a point here that most whites don't understand or don't even know yet. But something happened. I can remember: "We want to be free by '63," is what we said, and we meant 1963; and we are not. We said now. We said, "Freedom now." We said, "We want to be integrated"; and after a hundred years, we saw that you are not ready. And so what is happening is that we are pulling back; and we are pulling back at a greater rate than you can imagine. And it is now somewhat dangerous for, shall I say, "middle class" black folks like me to be so frankly ready to talk to white people because every time we are, that puts us on the spot with black people who know that they cannot trust you, who know that they don't dare talk to you, that they do not dare betray to you what they think, and who suspect us if we still think it's worthwhile trying to communicate with you. If we still have integration as a goal, even distant, we then become "Uncle Toms."

In Chicago not so long ago a meeting of Afro-American educators was called for us by some of us. None of you were called, none of you were there; we wanted to get together ourselves and not have to have you there snooping, to go out and give sensational reports of what we said and did. We wanted to do some planning among ourselves. Now, there's a positive side to this. Divide and rule has been America's way with us, as it has been with the poor white folks, but especially with us. We have always been encouraged to betray one another. Of the hundreds of slave revolts which were attempted or planned, the majority were betrayed by house servants. The pattern was established then and it goes on. So it has come to pass now that those whose suspicion and hatred have surfaced, who have yet to build pride in themselves, are very, very suspicious of those of us who will, as they put it, "work with the system," because the assumption is that as other black people have in the past been subverted by whites, we may be. Perhaps we have been. Perhaps we are the spies among our own people. There is this danger when we talk to you, so we have to be pretty stubborn and very much concerned about the need for our communicating.

Participant: I'd like to know where Mr. Chambers is from and what he's doing.

Chairman: He's from Omaha, and I understand he's a barber. And quite evidently he's a barber much better educated than some of us. Here he is, and he can tell you about himself. There were some excerpts from his testimony to the Commission on Civil Disorders in a spring issue of Ebony magazine. That was a sort of introduction of Mr. Chambers to the country. Mr. Chambers, would you like to tell them a little more about yourself. The question just was "Where are you from?"

Mr. Ernest Chambers: Well, I think the less I can say about myself the better it is because that begins to inject the idea of personality and I'd like to stay away from that, because we're all the same. I'm thirty-one years old and I have three children and a wife and they are primarily my reasons, my immediate reasons, for doing everything that I do and say. I look at my children now who are too young to understand really everything that I say and do, but I say, "If they were adults now and judged what I'm doing, how would they judge me?" And that keeps me on the strait and narrow. It causes me to do things that maybe I wouldn't do otherwise. It causes me to say things which I might not ordinarily say; because everybody wants to be a good fellow, everybody wants to be popular, everybody wants to be liked. Women fix their hair and wear their clothes for this purpose. Men affect different kinds of appearances for this purpose. But see, the thing is so serious with us that if I want my child to have a chance to grow up even, then I can't go for all that. Maybe some other men can do it, but I cannot.

So those are my reasons; I've got four of them: I have a wife for whom I'd give everything that I have -- but I hope I don't because I want to be with her; I want to grow old with her -- and I have three little children, and I want to grow old while they grow up. But see, these are dreams that we have which may not ever be realized. And then I have about sixty million other reasons scattered around the country, in the form of human beings who are being mistreated.

Participant: I'd like to respond to one of the women who said that they resented being lumped together with whites who had made mistakes in the past of assuming that human beings are nothing more than chattels. I think that for the most part the white community has lived in a dreamland. And I think that the things that you heard today, either for the first time or perhaps never before so bluntly, are just an attempt to bring you to reality. I had always assumed that the police force was something to be respected. I'm from Seattle, which prides itself on a fairly permissive attitude and I had been told that the blacks are very satisfied and that there weren't any overt acts of discrimination. Since being involved in the black community, I know that this is very false. I've had things committed toward me in the black community on behalf of the white police force. And I think that we must wake up now to what's going on and decide to attack the white power structure. The blacks have got themselves together. But I think that until you can go back and do something about the white population things are going to get worse before they get better.

Chairman: Of course, we aren't nearly as much together as we need to be, but we're working at it. There's a question about the matter of all white people being lumped together. And aside from what you said in the meeting, would you speak to the question of whether or how white people, without realizing it may be involved in discrimination which is institutionalized.

Mr. Chambers: The thing I hold is that white people know what they're doing. They might blank it out of their minds and pretend they're not aware that it's discrimination, because being kind and sympathetic and forgiving like we are, we try to place the best construction on anybody's actions and we forgive and forget too quickly. And this enables white people to erect a wall behind which they can hide and say, "I didn't know I was doing this." But he doesn't do it to white men. He's not going to walk up to his white friend and rub him on his head; and even if he can, he can't rub me on mine. His rights stop where my nose begins. So I think that when a white man does something which is insulting to me, he knows that it's insulting because he knows the kind of culture he lives in. He can watch television, he can go to movies and read newspapers and understand what the attitude between white and black is in this country. And he cannot plead ignorance anymore. So I don't believe there are any innocent white people. And I'm sorry I wasn't here when the lady who protested to being lumped with slave holders made her protest, because I would ask her if she's saying that she doesn't want to be identified with George Washington any more. And if she doesn't want to any more, was she content to be identified with him in the past? Do you consider George Washington a hero?

Participant: I guess I was taught that he was a hero.

Mr. Chambers: If the things that I said are true, are true, do you still consider him a hero?

Participant: I guess I sort of wonder.

Mr. Chambers: All right. Do you think that the charges I make are serious enough, since this man is given to your children as a hero also, that it's at least worth teachers looking into?

Participant: Oh, I think it's worth teachers looking into.

Mr. Chambers: And you can start with The American Heritage History of the Presidents.

Participant: You know, there's something else here in this whole history presentation that we have to look at. I'm forgetting the question of the black people for just a moment; go back to the kind of teaching we did about the Indians. Now we're having to revise our teaching in the school about our role as white colonists coming over here and doing dreadful things to the Indians. I think teachers are beginning to face the truth in the classroom about our role in this, that there are two sides to this question. And I don't think it's hopeless. I think it's quite possible that teachers -- white teachers -- are going to be looking for truth rather than a myth.

Chairman: The question of whether it's hopeless from the black or the white side of the fence is in part a question of time. And I think we have very different conceptions of how much time we have. White people apparently figure, "Well, now we're beginning to wake up. Just give us time." And *we* can look back four hundred years and say, "*Time* *has* *run* *out.*" Got to wake up real, real fast. Now if there is hope, it's hope through a terrific speed in education that *white* Americans must do among *white* Americans. Do you think you can do it really fast?

Participant: I don't know, because just individually talking to people I say, "We are responsible for the position these people are in. *We.*" And they don't know what I'm talking about when I say "we."

Mr. Chambers: You know what though? Young white people, I think, are going to do more teaching to their elders than all the words that I say because as this lady pointed out, she thought the police were great guys. And there might have been a lot of people who before the Democratic Convention in Chicago thought it was great and wouldn't acknowledge that Mayor Daley is a gangster. (I said this in Illinois, so I'll say it here.) There's a police commissioner in Philadelphia; they feel he had Mafia contacts in New York. But these are the kind of men they make heads of police departments, because the job of the policeman is not to maintain law and order and uphold the law -- not as those terms are generally understood -- but it's to suppress and hold down black people. And this is why you get such inferior types on the police force.

They showed some interviews on Huntley-Brinkley the other night, and a policeman said that the one thing he liked about police work is that you don't have to stay in one place at one time. How many places can he be in at one time? And he had other statements like that all the way through. They failed psychological tests. But these are just forms to gather all these guys in off the street who can't get jobs any place else. They're rejects of white society. I've read police reports and they cannot even spell the words which label the kind of crimes that they're supposed to be describing. They know nothing about sentence structure or punctuation. They are the rejects of white society, so when time comes to clamp down on them for their viciousness and brutality and they tell you, "We're going to quit if you do anything to reprimand this guy who obviously committed a wrong," don't worry about it; he can't quit because he can't get another job. He knows this. And don't let him terrorize any of you. If you check any other profession, you wouldn't find one where a person would first begin to function and then be given training. You train first, then enter into the profession. Why is it that in the most delicate, sensitive area of a society's life, you're going to pick the most poorly qualified individuals and entrust it to them?

All the man who claims to be on the side of the law has got to say is "Impeach Earl Warren. I'm against the Supreme Court. They're shackling the hands of the law." Yet, you know what the law was doing? Unlawful breaking and entering, illegal searches and seizures, unlawful interrogations, holding people without charge and without bond contrary to the law. They were the law violators. And by the way, this is something I withheld this morning. You know why Bobby Baker's not going to go to jail, besides the political friendship of Lyndon Johnson? The Justice Department violated the law by using wire tapping and eavesdropping devices in getting evidence against him. So why don't the reporters, when they talk about criminals going loose, mention that Bobby Baker is the one who's being coddled, and he's a dear friend of the President? The Justice Department and J. Edgar Hoover violated the law. But J. Edgar Hoover is the king of all the police and he is an ignorant man from the nineteenth century. He's not up-to-date and he's totally out of touch. Can you imagine any other country having a man like J. Edgar Hoover as the head of its investigative force? But the United States will, and then they wonder why they're deteriorating.

What I was going to say about your youth teaching you is connected with what I learned in school about zoology; nature tries to maintain any species in existence and because of trying to maintain the species, individuals sometimes suffer. The weak die and the strong live. And when you find an individual in that species who wantonly destroys his young, then this is an act of suicide for the species because it's through your youth that you have a potential for immortality. And when you find an animal that'll do that, he's called a freak in nature. So when you find white people destroying their own youth like they were doing in Chicago, and then others glorifying the police and justifying this destruction of their youth, this is an act of suicide; it represents a "death wish." Could this be that white people recognize how vicious they've been throughout history and they wish to die? And they're going to die through their youth by literally killing them.

But these young people are going to be judges, they're going to be corporation heads, and they're going to be attorneys; and they're going to remember those criminals who wore blue uniforms and busted them up side the head in the name of law and order. And then if he's sitting up here as a judge and the only reason this cop has brought this young man up before him is because he's got a beard, then he's going to remember what happened to him. And he's going to know this is a brute and a bully and an ignoramus who ought to be in prison his own self and maybe there'll come some changes.

But like the sister said here, time is not on the side of the United States of America, not only because of what's happening in this country but the international context. Why cannot America go get the Pueblo from Korea? Why cannot America stop Russia from invading Czechoslovakia? And why was it that as soon as America warned Russia that if she did anything in West Germany which Russia shouldn't do, that there would be retaliation? Russia came out the next day and said, "Because of Neo-Nazi activities, we're considering taking strong measures to crush it, and we have the power to do this under some kind of agreement that they had." Russia is not afraid of America. America has admitted that her army is stretched out in Vietnam, five hundred and something thousand young men. Their air force is stretched to the breaking point because they have pilots, some of them above fifty years old, flying planes. Their fleet in the Pacific cannot even take care of their regular duties, their patrolling because of Vietnam. England has pulled out of Southeast Asia now and left America over there, after tricking her into that position. America was going to fire her Minuteman II missile last month in one of the Dakotas, and had Congressmen, newspapermen, and the head of SAC, which is just outside of Omaha, there. They were going to have a great display of American might and power because the Minuteman II is the backbone of the American defense missile system. So like the little rhyme says:

> Old King Cole is a merry ole soul
> And a merry ole soul is he;
> He called for his pipe and he called for his bowl,
> And he called and he called and he called.

All right, they had the countdown and they pushed the button and got all these systems working and they waited, and they waited, and they waited, and they are still waiting and the missile has never fired. Russia has a missile defense system and a missile attack system which works. America's does not work. And all of you should keep this in mind: although they want you to think in insulated isolationist terms, you're not isolated. And while you're making studies and polls of everybody else, the world has you under a microscope and all of your flaws and defects are coming into sharp focus.

Participant: I just wonder on the strategic question, whether indeed the young are going to teach the elders. I think some of the young are going to be able to teach some of the elders. I think our problem is larger than that. We have a problem in the educational system. And I think functionally that we have to start with teachers because they're at the bottom of many of the things we've been talking about.

Chairman: I think what we're talking about is the education of teachers. And starting with teachers, I would like to raise a question of whether we mean starting with teachers listening or starting with teachers telling. I think here we're supposed to be listening. We're supposed to be learning as much as we can about the community, the communities, and about the people who send children to the schools. I have a feeling that primarily our job here is to find out what the situation happens to be like in the community, so that we may adapt what we do in teaching. Ours is a listening job here mainly, I think. But of course, we have to talk in order to hear from others.

Participant: I just wanted to comment on something that was said before about how much time has gone by without too much improvement. And I just wanted to say that the United States is an inherently racist country. I don't think that racism has gotten one tiny bit better with all the time that's gone by. I think the only reason that the Indians finally got out from underneath racism was because they were exterminated; I think the only reason that the Italians, the Irish, and the Jews got out from under racism was because they blended into the society. And with the black man, unfortunately, his skin color is the badge of his separateness; and since his skin color isn't about to go away, there's nothing that's going to stop the racism that's directed against black people. I don't think it's a question of time; I think that the basic nature of the society has to be changed. And the only way it's going to be changed is if the schools and the education system becomes a force to blast racism wherever it appears.

Now I live in Brooklyn, and the people in my building are really incredible. The woman that lives right across the hall from me says to her kids "Pick up those toys. What do you think I am? A nigger?" All right, this is what we have at home. And I would say if not a majority, then such a large minority that it's worth counting as a majority of white Americans are racist. So we're going to have racist teaching at home; what we need is for the school to be an anti-racist teacher. And I think that it's really so obvious that it shouldn't have to be said.

Chairman: But it's not easy, because these people want to know where they start to become less racist themselves, to inform themselves to be able to listen when people say different things. They still need help. I mean we, we teachers still need to know.

Participant: I get some terrible hangups when you start talking about Thomas Jefferson, because there are certain things about Thomas Jefferson I've always admired in terms of freedom of speech and expression and press. It seems to me that we're acting right now under those things that he talked about. I don't want to throw out the baby with the water. I'm perfectly willing to acknowledge that he had slaves.

Chairman: Are you willing to acknowledge what that means too? You know, not just, "Yes, he had slaves and so what?" But "He had slaves and therefore."

Participant: Well, this doesn't necessarily make invalid everything he said. If we're going to throw everything he said out, then we're going to throw out the situation we have here where we're all calling our leaders gangsters.

Chairman: Really, were you being asked to throw everything he said out or just to stop worshipping him as if he were perfect?

Participant: Well, all right.

Mr. Chambers: And you know what else Thomas Jefferson said? He was a racist. He said black people can't learn like white people. I was quoting him when I said that, and if you want to find it, it's in his writing called Notes on Virginia. How am I, a black man, going to say a racist is all right. Like Dan Goodwin says, Adolph Eichman and Adolph Hitler said some great things. I could take a section from Hitler's Mein Kampf and let you read it and you would think he's talking about American ghettos today; he was talking about his own experiences and things he observed. So we're going to forget that he exterminated six million Jews, because how can you make a guy all bad when he said some good things? His words are greater than his deeds. Jesse James walked in the bank and said, "Man, I hate to do this, give me your money." So if it was your bank, you would say, "He really said some good things, so we're not going to throw out the baby with the water."

Participant: What are we going to base all this on then?

Mr. Chambers: Truth. And because this country cannot face the truth about itself, this is why it's coming apart at the seams now. A young generation is coming on the scene who wants to see the truth. And a lot of older people are going to feel a desire and an obligation to defend a false position, which they know is false. The same reason you say that the Russians are bad for going into Czechoslovakia, is why you say Thomas Jefferson was worse than they for holding personal slaves of his own. Either you believe that a moral principle is right, without deviation and with consistency, or you don't believe in morality. Do you want me to enslave you? Would you want me to take a child if you've got him, and sell him to Dan who will take him to Omaha and make a slave out of him?

Participant: No.

Mr. Chambers: Would you consider me a good man if I did that to you?

Participant: No.

Mr. Chambers: Suppose I wrote about freedom of speech and of the press while I was doing it. So what I'm telling you is to put yourself in that position; that's how you can evolve some principles of right and wrong. Know what you want for yourself at least as a start and then after you do what you would want for yourself, for somebody else; sophistication coming through education and experience will carry you beyond that point. But for you to indicate that a slave holder is a good man -- that flaws his whole character and makes everything he said hypocrisy.

Participant: I want to come back to another question in terms of time and what we can do. If you reflect, there are lots of things that can be done, and can be done immediately. I think, take the New York City school system as a case in point where the black community for X number of years has said "The white community has failed. Look at what's happened to our kids. Give us control over our schools." And they won't do it.

Chairman: And the teachers struck.

Participant: Then this is precisely the point. How much more time do you want to continue this kind of system? So if you really are interested in changing the system and changing people as well, give the black community the control over their schools. And if they fail, at least they've had the chance. They'll never have that chance. And you can do it tomorrow. You don't have to wait next year or two years hence. I think this is one instance, and a very small one.

Chairman: In doing this, does this mean converting your faculty?

Participant: Whatever the people in power want to do, allow them to do it, period. No "ifs," "ands," or "buts." And if the thing comes apart, it comes apart. You can pick the pieces up, hopefully.

It can't be done any worse. But I just used this as one example. I think you can compound this.

Chairman: I think this is one of the reasons for the focus of this conference, that we are to learn what the community wants. But letting them have control is one of the four main points. How do we teachers who are used to controlling bring ourselves to the point of letting the parents and the students have much more control than they've ever had before? Any ideas on that?

Mr. Chambers: Recognize the existing incompetency of the people who call themselves teachers now; they are total failures. The school should be the friend of the community, but the schools are taking the place of the police department and teachers are becoming like policemen, and we have one attitude toward all of them. And for my part it's becoming a physical thing. I have to go into the schools and handle teachers physically because they are physically abusing children. A teacher six feet eleven -- and this is not an exaggeration, he had to stoop to get into the door, two hundred and ninety-nine pounds -- slapped my little sister. I almost strangled him to death literally, and I'm just sorry that I didn't; but had I done that, I wouldn't be here now, although I feel I was justified. Why are these people, who I feel are perverted and sadistic and the kind of people who become prison guards so they can have captives, do these things? Then other teachers in the building who know about it play like it doesn't go on and defend the school and say it's an unjustified attack on the teachers. If you had any _esprit de corps_, you would be quicker to want to weed that person out than I, because you want to elevate your profession and you want it to have standing. But instead you show us there _is_ honor among thieves. And since all of you gather together to justify and defend this incompetent, it tends to make us feel "birds of a feather flock together," and whereas _his_ incompetency was revealed today, _yours_ will be revealed tomorrow. But if you're confident of your position and you know that you're right, you don't fear me or anybody like us. You see us as your friends, because we all say we want the children to be educated.

White people have always controlled their schools in their neighborhoods, and they have messed it up. It's only when black people want control that we begin to say, "Let's not think in racial terms, let's think in human terms" -- which is saying we're not human beings.

Maybe I can give a better example. Some writers are writing stories, and they are told, "Don't write about black people, write about humans." It's telling him that any story about black people is not about human beings. The only way you can write about human beings is to write about *white* people. The only way you can speak in human terms is to speak in *white* terms. We don't buy that any more. And we're in a position where we can stop the schools from functioning. Not just in the ghetto, but all over the cities. So if we were really destructive and didn't want education to occur, we could end that tomorrow, just like the man said that control could be turned over tomorrow.

So it's going to come either with your complicity and assistance, or we're going to take it, or nobody's going to have it at all. I'm not going to watch some other child get what my child ought to have, when he can't have it. We're going to see that *all* children have it or *no* children are going to have it. If we take such a position, then maybe you'll come around to the position we wanted originally, where you say like we said, "All children should have the opportunity." If you listen, that's what we're telling you. *We are the best friends you've got.*

We're telling you you're a failure and we want to help you cease to fail. But you know you're incompetent. You haven't done the job. Because the coat is pulled on you, you get mad. Don't hide it and fight it. Why don't you correct the problem? That's what you tell the children in school. We judge you by the same stuff you talk in the classroom. You want the child to sit there and listen to you when that's what he's there for. But you can't sit and listen when that's what you're there for, and you should have more emotional control than the child. So at least give the child as much as you want for yourself.

But you can't do that. You're not geared to do that. You're geared to maintain the system as it is and to make a child identify the political party in power with the government, so that if he goes against Lyndon Johnson, he's against the government. He's not a patriot; he's committing treason. You are the ones who will not take issue with George Wallace's erroneous definition of treason -- "wishing for a victory by the Viet Cong." The Constitution describes treason, among other things, as "levying war against the United States." What was George Wallace doing when he used armed National Guardsmen to resist the implementation of the Federal Court order? That, by the Constitution, is treason. But the government did not cite him for contempt and he didn't spend a day in jail. And every political science teacher, every history teacher, every social studies and modern problems teacher should have taken this as an example of government derelict in its duty and weakening its own internal structure by violating and disregarding its own law.

But you're not going to do this. You want little stylized lesson plans which don't go beyond the borders of a book or the top and bottom borders of a page, which you can show and say, "See how neatly I do my work?" But you don't get anything across because you don't know anything yourself. And the children learn until they get in school and they know what the real world is and that's why they can outsmart you. You don't have sense enough as adults to know -- and I'm saying it like this on purpose; this is the way teachers talk to children: not like they're human beings with feelings, not like the teacher was ever a child, but like the child came from another planet and the teacher did not pass through infancy, childhood, adolescence and so forth -- that the object of teaching is not just for you to put notions in a child's head, like "Columbus was here in 1492." You're dealing with a human being and you're dealing with a young mind which you can shape and mold. If you know your job properly, then you're trying to make this a better human being.

I was teaching a course in black history this summer; I also taught the children the meaning of words, the necessity of understanding words, what a dictionary is, how to distinguish a dictionary from an encyclopedia. But when they left and people asked them what they had been studying, they said, "Black history" because that's what it was called. So you don't have to restrict what you're teaching. You are a total human being in the classroom. So, even though you might be teaching art, if something comes up about science, you should be versatile enough to speak about it because you want the child to learn something about it all. If you're less than the child, don't expect him to be more than you.

Participant: Mr. Chambers is running for the Omaha School Board, and I think one of the things that might be useful would be to explore what he's going to say about the teachers that are in the schools, if he gets on the school board. How is he going to try to get the teachers to be different? He's trying to hook into a machine and he's trying to change the system. So I want you to take what he says in relationship to a possibility of his having a real impact on one school system in this country, and to have some real dialogue here. You say what you think and he says what he thinks as to where we, the trainers of teachers, fouled up and where we can do a better job in bringing better teachers into the classroom, because you may confront him as a school board member six months from now.

Participant: This was a question that's been bothering me. How can he achieve his aims without alienating people who already are moving in that direction?

Participant: Well, I think there are two roles. Maybe Mr. Chambers is not going to hook into a machine and achieve the kinds of things that we would like to see achieved. But he has played a role here which is highly important. He has shocked us.

Participant: Supposing he is on the school board. He's mentioned hypocrisy. He is going to alienate people; he won't be successful unless he does. But he's going to get with him in the process strong people, who are willing, like Mr. Foster, to take the consequences of their position. We found out that in my community a Negro has been considered for a job as a teacher and somebody says he doesn't have the qualifications. Now all he's going to do if he's on the school board is to say, "Well, now wait a minute. Is that a rule? If a guy doesn't have the qualifications, he can't teach? Let's see if it applies equally. Here are a hundred people with letters of authorization which say they don't have qualifications. But someone is willing to write a letter and say 'How about letting them teach for a year?' And then after the year, if they show themselves okay, they somehow waive requirements and pretty soon they're in there." Now, that has meaning not just for black or white but for everybody. It's the whole question of an ethic in the system.

Mr. Chambers: Now teachers are the ones who should try to bring this equity into existence. But if they have these divisions in their minds themselves, they can't give it to somebody else. And it's hard for a black person to say words that a white person will listen to and understand as he's saying. But the teachers are here at this meeting to try to get a feeling. As somebody stated, not an educational system all laid out, because you can find that by reading books; but there is a soul which is missing from the edifice which you have constructed.

There is no life in it. Do any of you watch "Dark Shadows?" Maybe you're in school and can't. But they're in the process of making a body for a man that they already created out of other bodies and they need a life force to bring it into existence. Lying on the table, it looks exactly like a sleeping person. But this one who's alive will wake up, that other one until it gets a life force, won't.

You have an organization which has no life. It goes back to the past and it goes for dead things because it is dead. It worships dead things. That's why Thomas Jefferson and George Washington mean so much -- because the system of death worships death, *and it kills children*. That's why a man could write a book about the mistreatment of children in school and call it *Death at an Early Age*.

I think that the teaching organization is one of the things that really does dehumanize people -- not only the children, but the teachers. I've known people who were nice people until they became teachers. Then they began to become very fearful, and all of a sudden they didn't understand the problems of children anymore. And adults will tell me I shouldn't say "we" and "they" when I'm speaking of black people and white people, but I hear teachers speaking with reference to themselves and children as "we" and "they." The teachers have drawn battle lines between themselves and the children. The teachers are the ones who say, "Give us combat pay for going into the area." The teachers are the ones who say, "The ghetto schools are where I don't want to teach." And the teachers are the ones who say, "I don't want to teach there because the children are not learning, because there are inadequate facilities, inadequate equipment." They give all the reasons for not wanting to teach; then when I and the community have our eyes opened to this and I put it back on the teachers and say, "These reasons that you outlined are why my child can't learn, not because I'm ignorant," all of a sudden you become defensive and, as a part of the system, you're being attacked too and you say, "No. The equipment is the same. The facilities are the same. The teachers are qualified." *Then* you're a liar and a hypocrite to me, and I see that you're one of those people who are destroying my child. That's why we have a tendency to lump all white people together, because at a conference like this or some place else where nobody's watching them, a white person might want to say, "I'm not like that." But they get back in the system and you can't tell the difference. They walk in lock step; they wear the same expression on their faces; the same words come out when you come up on any issue. And there's no need for a teacher to say, "We want to sit down and discuss your child's problems," because you know what the teacher's going to say before she or he opens their mouth. Everything is stylized and stereotyped in their life. They are the automatons; they are the ones who no longer live. They fit the description of zombies -- walking dead.

Chairman: Is there anything further you want to say on the question of how you would want to work on a school board to bring about some of the things you have talked about?

Mr. Chambers: I would let the teachers know that I recognize that this idea of superman is still needed by them, not just their children; they need a superman and I'm going to be their superman. I'm going to spread my arms and my cape and take all of them under my wings like a mother hen does her little chickens and save them from this vicious administration. And in me, they have somebody who will listen to their problems and go into the schools and help them get what they need. And we will attack the school board together. I'm going to take away everybody's excuse if I get on the board.

And I think parents should have access to everything that goes on in the schools. I've let them know there will be no secret meetings if I get on the board. As soon as we have a meeting, no matter what it's about, then I'm going to tell the press and everybody else, because the people in the school systems work for the people who send their children to school. And if parents have a right to know anything, it's everything pertaining to the education of their children.

Since the teachers couldn't believe that I'd be for real, and they might want to operate in an anonymous fashion, I'd ask them to offer suggestions on how we can improve the school system. And all those suggestions which appeared to me to be valid -- I don't care what the racists think, we're going to get busy and try to implement them.

I would take a leading role in having federal funds and state funds cut off to the local school district if it's not doing the job that it's supposed to do in conformity with the program it's deriving funds from. No more using disadvantaged black and white children to make statistics to get money and then the money is not used to upgrade education. No more tacking on the cafeteria so that you can say, "We spend so much out in the ghetto." Adding a cafeteria has not upgraded education at all. No more 1958 textbooks in the ghetto school and 1968 textbooks in the white school. No more building brand new schools for white children with planetariums and having schools for black children with inadequate furnaces.

In other words, I'd tell them that black people are the bottom of the barrel. When you raise the bottom of the barrel, you raise everything in it; and so when I say that I'm interested in the welfare of black children, they have to be intelligent enough to project from this and understand that I mean ultimately all children.

I'm for children. I dislike adults. If it was in my power to destroy one and leave the other, I would destroy the adults. In an argument between an adult and a child, I'd believe the child. One of them is not telling the truth. When I was a child, teachers lied on me. My parents believed them, and the school administration would believe them, and the press would believe them. But I knew. This person who my parents had taught me to respect was lying on me, and I could see him telling the lie. So I have great lack of confidence in adults when it comes to dealing with children, because they'll lie on children to cover their own incompetence and they'll take their problems from home to school and take it out on the children. They'll read something about Rap Brown or Stokely Carmichael and they say "Wait until I get in that classroom."

There was a teacher teaching in my little boy's school who said she was against open housing and she didn't want black people living near her. She's not there any more. There was a big principal that I testified about in Washington -- I called him the jolly white giant, and told the superintendent he was an ox and if he didn't yoke him, I was going to have to muzzle him or slaughter him. He's no longer there. The principal of this black ghetto school -- who happened to be a black man and a Tom -- that I'd complained about because that's where a lot of brutality against black children was occurring, is no longer there.

Do you know that there is a school in Omaha which is still in violation of fire ordinances which were brought against them in 1960? They were corrected not because somebody on the board was responsible, not because the city council was concerned or the fire department would assume its responsibility, but because they made the mistake of letting me get on a panel television show and I snitched on all of them. It embarrassed the school system who attacked the fire department and it embarrassed the fire department so they attacked the schools, and they're in the process of trying to rectify this situation.

The two schools have cafeterias and entire kitchens now, not because the health department saw that they would let this food sit up a long time in one place and bring it to the ghetto or because it was improperly handled in transit and improperly placed in containers, but -- because I, who am considered irresponsible and destructive and irrational, got behind the school board and got a little publicity from the television people -- now they're building cafeterias and kitchens like they should have done in the first place.

So if they see that there are those of us who are going to hold on with bulldog-like tenacity and they're going to have to come around anyway to do what their duty is, why can't we sit down and identify the problem for them and assist them in doing what they know they're going to have to do? And they can't blame me for bringing a disruption in the system by making the children aware of their inequalities, because the children know it even before I do.

So when we identify the problem and they know we're not crazy, then they ought to go ahead and thank us and we join hands and work together. But because they won't, we know that it's an "us" and "them" situation: them to oppress us, us to fight them. It's becoming more and more physical now. The school, which should be the symbol of stability in a community, is going to become a target, with windows broken and fires started, because the school is the enemy of the children. And the teachers are responsible.

They can't pass the buck to the administration because the teacher ought to stand up to the administration, even if it means being fired. All of you, and myself too, are going to have to draw a line. You are going to have to say, "This administration has bullied and buffaloed and denatured and castrated me and it's not going to buffalo me anymore. If I've never been a man in my life, if I've never been a woman in my life, then for the sake of these children if not my own, I'm going to stand up and be a human being."

Talk about standing up sounds good, but I know nobody's going to do it. If they were going to do it, they wouldn't need me to say it.

There is very little that I can say to you that's "new," except maybe some things about George Washington which are individual facts rather than something you arrive at through a process of reasoning. So all of the things that I've reasoned to, you have reasoned to those things a long time ago. And if I say something and it makes you angry, it can only be because you've thought of it and you haven't come to grips with that thing in your own mind and you know you should and you get mad at me instead of yourself. Don't do that. If a thing is true, I accept it. In the long run, truth is what must prevail.

When Castro was trying to get his revolution going in Cuba, there was a tendency -- an inclination -- to exaggerate the number of the enemy they killed to get the populace on their side. But then they got together and they said, "In the short run it may gain us something. But over the long haul the people are going to see that if we're killing all these soldiers, why do they still see the men walking around alive in the army. Ultimately, we'd best tell the truth. Then the people will know that no matter how unpleasant it is, how bad a light it casts us in, we're going to tell the truth. Then when it comes to a crucial issue and they have to decide one way or the other and they don't have enough facts to do so and they have to take somebody's word, they're going to take the word of the one who's been honest with them, even when it was detrimental to himself."

Teachers unfortunately don't have this kind of credibility in the community. They don't even have it among themselves.

Participant: Not very often do we have a chance to be here long enough to hear all the kinds of things you're saying. You are saying on the one hand, "Tell the truth." You're saying on the other hand, "I teach my child that all white men are against him."

Mr. Chambers: Let me clear this up right now. You have imputed something to me which is not correct. My little boys have white friends. My little children understand what you don't understand. A child doesn't make fine distinctions and gradations for himself. When you have given him a general body of precepts, then he apparently learns what I assume that adults would learn: how to make distinctions with his own judgment. But in general, white people are against him. Now how am I going to tell him, "Mark, in general, white people are against you?" I have to say, "Mark, all those white people are against you." But he's got sense enough to know that he has never seen me mistreat anybody's child. And white kids live in the area where I live, because I live in the housing projects. And when these little kids come over or when my kids go visit these little kids, there is no abuse of anybody's child. Little white children know who they can go to when they want somebody to defend them against an adult. White adults are going to have to stop becoming so defensive and try to understand that you deal with the mind of a child differently than you do with an adult. My child is not a black racist. My child, I feel, could come here and lead some adults, when it comes to understanding the realities of life, because there is a truth in an abstract intellectual sense and there is a truth in the real world where people live. And I deal with my child on the basis of this truth in the world where he lives. If there's a tiger in the streets and I don't tell him, and the tiger consumes him, that's my fault. If I tell him some white people are all right, then he might drop his guard and he'd get wiped out.

There are bus drivers who insult our children on the bus. There are teachers in Omaha who want to use the term "Sambo" in the classroom. Now if I haven't alerted him to this, then I've failed. Since I haven't alerted him, he assumes that it's all right because he believes now that I tell him the things he ought to know. But if a teacher treats him decently, he comes home and tells me that also.

Participant: How do you learn to trust any person then, regardless of color?

Mr. Chambers: I don't want him to trust anybody. What I want him to do is learn that adults are deceitful in general, and that if they can't show by the way they treat him that he should think something of them, he doesn't have to think anything of them. My children don't have to respect old people just because they're old. In fact, I tell them if they're old they're probably unworthy of respect, because the good die young.

Participant: Well, when I teach in a classroom, I try to teach, ultimately, self worth. If you can get the child to believe that they're worth something, then you can teach them other things. But first of all, they have to feel important in their own right. Well, how can you get across to a child? Let's say that your child came into my classroom then, how could I show him except by putting my arm around him, that I love him?

Mr. Chambers: My child understands what he's going to school for. The teacher is not his mother. She may never put her arm around him because that's not what the teacher is for. The teacher is to teach him how to read and write and spell and things like that.

You don't try to teach him self worth. You show him that you feel he has worth by the way you treat him. I'm going to give you an example of what I'm trying to say. There's a black junior high school which finally was allowed to teach some courses in black history. The superintendent promised it, and then a week before school, he turned around and backed out of it because he thought we wouldn't have enough time to get it in. Well, it was brought to my attention and it is in the school now. We didn't have to picket or anything else.

But, anyway, I came to this class and the teacher felt grateful to me for some reason, and I appreciated this. So the kids acted like kids will in a classroom: some of them had their heads down, some were doodling in books. The teacher didn't want me to feel disrespected so she told them, "Sit up, Mr. Chambers is talking. Don't write in your book. Listen to Mr. Chambers." So I told her, "Well, I'm not really here as a teacher. I'm just going to talk to them so let me just talk to those who want to listen." She didn't say anything else, and I began to talk to them; pretty soon the books closed and the heads came up and they stopped doodling. So instead of telling the child, "Listen," say something that he wants to listen to. And if I can't say something he wants to listen to, I shouldn't say anything.

My wife made an observation to me too, in case I ever forget what I tell other people. She said, "Now look Ernie, if you ever do go into a situation and kids don't look up, the kid could be listening while his head is down." So what would you rather have, a kid with his head down listening or one sitting up looking alert with his mind someplace else? You just do the best that you can.

Participant: Before we can speak to people or think of ourselves as human beings, we have to get rid of fear. We have to get rid of fear of one group on the part of the other and vice versa. And I think that's a crucial question; how do we resolve that?

Mr. Chambers: Stop seeing each other in our own minds as being threats. You're not a threat to me unless I see you as that. And if you haven't done anything to harm me, I don't have any reason to believe you're a threat.

Participant: You threatened me yesterday. Let's lay it on the table.

Mr. Chambers: Do you know why? Because you may not have heard anybody talk to you like I did yesterday. But see, I'm the last person in the world at this conference who would do anything to harm you. And maybe I'd be the first one to come to your aid if somebody else was going to harm you, because in spite of the things that I said about all of the people who call themselves teachers, I see them as people. I see them as stunted people and cheated people, but they are still people. And if there was anything that I could do if they were in a tight spot, I would try to help them. So, you're going to have to not see me as a threat when I speak bluntly to you, because teachers are supposed to be dealing in truth. If what I say is false and we're dealing only with words, don't let my words intimidate you. Let him go ahead and make all of his false statements to try to defend his untrue positions, then meet his error with the truth.

I think part of a teacher's problem is that he or she will recognize a badge and a title and become intimidated by what those titles stand for and never look behind the title to see the man who's wearing it. There's not any man that I'm afraid of. Mohammed Ali, I feel, is the greatest fighter in the world. Now I'd be ridiculous, half his size, to say that I could whip him. But if he hits me, and I'm going to have to fight him, then what choice do I have? If I fold up and sit in a corner, he's going to whip me anyway. So you have to make up your mind that you're going to defend yourself against any kind of attack from anybody to the best of your ability. What did you fear from me? That might help us get at how to overcome it.

Participant: Well, I think that justifiably you were attacking, and I'm not questioning the justification of it. And I wasn't fearing you personally. But I think the quality of what you were saying engendered the feeling that the white people probably had reason to fear because of the injustices that have been done. And in reverse, I think you were expressing the fact that the black people were reacting as they were because of their fear in turn. I'm not asking about whether the fear is justifiable or whether it isn't justifiable. I'm asking how do you suggest that it can be overcome on the part of both groups, because you cannot be human to each other when you fear each other.

Mr. Chambers: I think fears are based on lack of knowledge and lack of understanding. I tried to give the example of Mohammed Ali to show that here's a man who I feel physically I couldn't whip. But I'd fight him and do my best to whip him if he attacked me.

Participant: But you're not afraid of him, because he's no threat to you.

Mr. Chambers: If he became a threat, then I've made up my mind as to the kind of person I am and the way that I have to do. Dan is the same way. We have been confronted by the police. I've spoken in front of hostile groups of white people with the only ally in the audience, Dan. How are he and I going to surround four hundred white people? I'm in the front of the room and he's in the back. It's all based on a lack of understanding of what our intentions and purposes are, because if I come before these people and I don't have guns, I'm not coming to kill. I'm going to say this is how we can avoid killing. So if there's an initial shock reaction and some feeling of fear or uncertainty, that's all right. That doesn't make any difference. What we have to do is arrive at the place where you are now, of saying that something should be done to alleviate it, and I don't think that anybody can sit down and itemize steps to take to alleviate fear.

Participant: Well, that wasn't really my question, because you have arrived at a degree of maturity which makes it possible for you personally to describe your feeling of confidence the way you do. But I think this has come through long struggle and introspection and analysis.

Mr. Chambers: But you know, it's not just confidence in myself. It's a realization and a recognition of how phony all the supposed threats are. The things we see as threats are not threats at all. Most things that people fear never come to pass. So that's why I keep saying, in your individual mind is where the fear resides. If you think that something terrible is in a darkened room, you're terrified and that thing is real to you. But still, objectively looking at it, there is no basis for your fear. There is nothing that's going to happen to you if you go into that room, no matter how much you believe it's going to. So if you could begin to divide in your mind those things that should justifiably cause you to be cautious and those things which exist only in your mind or which you've absorbed from other people through sympathy because they're afraid of it, then you can get rid of all of that and get right down to the kernel of what makes your life tick.

Participant: I just want to make one more point. Until fear is alleviated, we're going to continue to have hostility. I think we're both anxious to relieve the hostility and establish ourselves as interacting human beings.

Participant: I think you expressed earlier that if you feel good about yourself, you can feel good about other people. I'm wondering if one of the things which could break down some of the myths of racial prejudice is exploring some of the things that make white people fearful. And there are some real strong myths surrounding the Negro race. The sexual myth, for instance, is very threatening to the white male.

Mr. Chambers: I don't have the fears that you have. It takes somebody who might share those fears to at least tell me on what they're based. And if white people can bring forth the things that they are afraid of, frankly, if there was any way I could respond to it or this young man or the sister here, any of us, I think we would. But if we leave it just in the realm of generalized fear, then it can't be dealt with.

Participant: I think that what the white man fears is that the black man is capable of satisfying his white women better than he is.

Chairman: I would agree. This I also get from my contacts with whites. But put the two together. Their official fear is that black men want white women. Their actual fear of going along with it perhaps is that white women want black men.

Participant: There's a certain grain of truth in a lot of what we are exploring. Many white women in some of the groups that I work with harbor certain kinds of curiosities about the black male that even though they try to suppress them they will come out if they're given a comfortable enough situation in which to talk about it.

Mr. Chambers: And you know what I think it shows? That men like women and women like men. And because you're not allowed to function in this way properly, just like teachers and students cease being human beings in a classroom setting, when we put it in a racial context something is supposed to be different and male is not to be attracted to female. That's what it amounts to. Not every white woman would go for every black man, although she might see some she would be responsive to. Not every black man would go for every white woman, although there are some he sees that he would be responsive to. And I have to quote a colleague of mine who said that "If men ever get to Mars and there are women on Mars, they can be red with green and purple polka dots and after we get used to the coloration, the men will be attracted to those women and those women will be attracted to these men." So if we could become mature in our handlings of sex like every other relationship between people, whether there are lines of race or anything else drawn, then I think some of the things which make people fearful wouldn't have to. Women are going to do what they want to do anyway; the women know this. Men are willing to help women do what they want to do, and the men know this. So if we all talk like the situation which really exists doesn't, then we are being dishonest again.

Look at my color. Look at my sister's color. Look at Dan's color. There have been minglings of people who supposedly shouldn't be doing this throughout history. Now, if there is fear in the white man that he can't do for his woman what a man ought to do for his woman, it's because he has destroyed himself in so many other areas first that when he approaches her, he can't approach her as a man because he feels inferior to her. This is why a lot of them will come into the ghetto and buy a "clean colored girl," because all he has to do is spend a few minutes with her and he's gone. There's no necessity of establishing a human relationship and his inferiority and inadequacy being discovered. And there are black prostitutes who have made men out of some white men by telling them, "Why don't you go home and do with your wife what you're trying to do out here?" And they will acknowledge that when they're with their wives, they feel they haven't got what it takes. So the fears that white men have about the superiority of the black man, sexually or any other way, could have become a justified fear now, whereas in reality it might have been a myth. During slavery times, there were white women who bore babies for black men held as slaves; they had to pass laws against this kind of thing. They had to impose great and severe threats of punishment on white women to keep them from these slaves. So if a man see his woman going for this -- we were like a chair -- she'd rather have a chair than him, well naturally this makes him feel somewhat unfulfilled. So it "justified him" in feeling that he was inferior. So he tells this woman, "Don't mess with that black man because he is savage and he's like a beast and if he ever got ahold of you in a sexual way, he would tear you up." Then she said "OH-H-H-H!" and waits for the opportunity of this thing to happen. The man himself has created a monster, and now the monster has come to fruition and there is no mechanism of control built in. He's being victimized by the thing he has created. And now the white man feels that he is inferior and he makes himself inferior.

Participant: Going back to what we were talking about earlier, about fear and courage, I'd like to give an example of something that happened to me and interpret it if I may. One night about ten thirty or eleven o'clock, I was walking down the streets of Omaha. There were a group of young Negro girls walking down the street being loud and boisterous, as girls of that age and group would be. They were about eleven or twelve years old, coming from a roller skating rink. They started yelling at me, because I was the only soul on the street, and I was white. My first impulse was to run. And then I had to have the courage to face the reality of the situation which was, "Look, these are kids; I teach kids this age; these are a group of girls acting like any group of girls I've ever seen when they get together after they've had a good time." I was frightened because one of them threw a rock at me to test me. But I had to do something overt. I walked up to those girls and we had a very pleasant conversation. They told me that they had had fun at the roller rink. Now what would have happened if I had not had the courage to come to the realization that these were children? These were eleven and twelve year olds. I deal with this type of child every day. Why was I afraid? Simply because they were black? The white ones were just as loud when they were together in a similar situation. A rock was thrown. It missed me by a mile. It wasn't intended to hit me. I think it was intended to test me.

Mr. Chambers: And to bring that into perspective, if the fear that you felt wasn't because the rock was thrown or these other things you mentioned, it was because they were young black girls.

Chairman: Do you think that if they had been the same number of young white girls, you would have been frightened, even with the rock being thrown somewhere near you?

Participant: No. You see, that's the realization I came to.

Participant: Every group of youngsters in every classroom will test every teacher when they come into the classroom for the first time to see what's going to happen.

Participant: Do you think you perhaps would have felt that if it was a white child who threw that rock at you, that this child had something for you individually, or because it was a Negro child you felt that it was based on your color and their hate for your color. I mean, it was a very general type of thing.

Participant: Yes, of course. But the thing is, once they saw that I was a human being, once I went up to them and talked to them, their hate diminished and my fear was gone.

Mr. Chambers: Let's not use the term "hate" right now with reference to these young people.

Participant: Yes. That's a misconception to begin with.

Participant: My concern is this. We have so many students going through our teacher education programs who have had anthropology courses, who've had sociology courses; they ought to know the facts, yet they graduate believing the myths. I don't think giving them knowledge is enough. There's something else that must be done and I really don't know the answer and I don't know if anyone else really knows the answer.

Mr. Chambers: People send me threatening letters and things like that through the mail all the time, and they send me stuff like this. It's called The Thunderbolt. It comes from Savannah, Georgia. At the top it says "The White Man's Viewpoint" and then it has "N. S. R. P., America's largest white racist party." I think what they meant to say was "white supremacist party." But anyway, this tells how Martin Luther King was a victim of his own terrorism. And then we come inside here -- and all the white men are going to know this is not true -- "Negro related to apes, not white people." Then they try to show how the black woman has the same configuration, skeletal structure, cephalic angle as the ape. And this is supposed to be what happened when an ape mated with a black woman and produced offspring. They don't have sense enough to know what a closed genetic system is. Then, "white girl mating with gorilla in 1968. Scientists await the moment when lovely Conchita Mendez will produce her half-ape half-human offspring." And there are white people who I imagine believe this, so can you see what we're up against?

They publish newspapers. And here's a cartoon. It's supposed to represent the Supreme Court and sitting in the middle is a man in a robe and horns and at the bottom it said, "Nine men against America." And at the top it says, "The Jew-stacked court." He's reading the Jewish Talmud, and the Bible and the Constitution have been thrown in the trash can. This is the kind of literature which is being produced by the forces that you have to combat. But you don't produce newspapers. You don't have forums where you discuss these kinds of things. I'm going to subscribe to the paper myself, and some of you ought to, to know what the other side is actually saying. There are vicious people in the world and they're not being nice like we are and they would not be as nice to a group of black people as I was to you yesterday. Read some of these things.

At least I didn't call you apes. I didn't call you animals. I said you have cheated yourself by acting in a way that makes you sub-human, but there is hope. And that's why we work with each other. They would not work with us.

[At this point, Mr. Chambers and Mr. Goodwin leave for another meeting.]

Participant: How did this tie-up between the blacks and the Jews come about?

Chairman: The people who are attacking are attacking both. Your fears about the sexual character of black people and what we can do and what you can't do and how we may differ, are the result of your telling one another things such as are found in The Thunderbolt. From the time that, in this country, your ancestors decided that slavery was to be preserved (but for blacks only) systematically in your churches, in your pseudo-science books, in your "anthropology" -- call it "zoology" -- you had highly respected specialists teaching Thunderbolt tales. Now you laugh at it.

You may say, "It's not respectable; only the ignorant do this." Well, the ignorant are rather well financed.

I think these sexual fears that we dragged out on to the surface, but which you use to whip us with, to whip one another when each of you steps a little bit out of line -- "Would you want your daughter to marry one?" -- are fears created by you or bought by you from people like the authors of The Thunderbolt. These myths you picked up sometimes in Europe and taught sometimes to Europe. As Hitler said, American racists were one of his main sources. They attacked Jews just as systematically.

The Klan loves us both, the Jews, the blacks; the White Citizens Council loves us both, the Jews, the blacks. Goodman, when in '64 he went into Mississippi, was quite clearly a Jew; they were after "that Jew with a beard." Anti-Semitism and hatred of blacks are all a part of the same picture. And I'm not going to let you kid me with remarks such as, "I've got nothing against Negroes but I can't stand Jews" or "I know some Jews who won't buy the reverse." Anti-Semitism and hatred of blacks are all a part of the same picture. And if you can laugh at this and not combat it, you're a part of the picture too. It's yours.

Participant: Our students graduate with the myths even though they've gone through all these courses and they are supposedly enlightened. They're not.

Participant: But you're assuming that it's rational knowledge that will combat this kind of mythology.

Chairman: Well, it depends on which knowledge you choose. Incidentally, there is knowledge and knowledge. There is, for example, the knowledge that black people are related to apes. That's knowledge for some people. You choose the knowledge to spread. Let's not kid ourselves. This is fact for some people.

Participant: How do you counteract it?

Chairman: For one thing, you don't pretend it doesn't exist. And you don't pretend that people don't take it seriously. And you go to the roots and find out where these ideas of theirs came from. They're rooted in American history. They're rooted in the determination to make slavery respectable by denying humanity to those persons who were to be retained as slaves. And if you don't face that, then there's no point in saying, "Well why on earth could people think this?"

* * *

Participant: Every time a teacher comes in front of a new class, he wonders, am I going to be big enough to help them? And it's not a "we--they" situation, because I think a good many of us go out anticipating that we're going to give of ourselves. The question is, "Can I establish this?" And so, as we're training teachers, we have to make them sensitive of this. We have to help them learn their lessons and have to help them be able to compare. Is the thing that's different here something that they've done, something about the way they operate, something about the group, something about the cultural setting, or is it a black-white issue? And I suspect that if we were living at the level we're talking of that we wouldn't start out assuming that there was a black-white issue.

Chairman: Well, you know, from Blackboard Jungle on out, we sort of got the habit of thinking that the schools are jungles because the kids are jungle cats and that the teachers are just poor, weak victims. At least that's the picture I get in Blackboard Jungle. Up the Down Staircase is a little bit different, but we can entertain ourselves at professional meetings about how horrible things are in school. And maybe sometimes we're on the administrators and sometimes we're on the kids, but we're almost never on ourselves.

Participant: It isn't the kids that are creating the jungle. It's a bureaucracy; it's a staff that doesn't know how to cope with what the reality of urban education is today. There isn't enough money. The humanness is gone. I don't think you can blame the teachers directly for being nonhuman. They're simply reflections of the dehumanization of urban life within what we commonly call the inner city. These teachers are terrified. Yes, they're terrified. They use whatever method they can to cope with their terror. It is not that they are terrified of the children per se, although some of them are that.

Chairman: Do you see any point at which we can do anything to break this vicious circle?

Participant: Yes. I certainly do. One thing I would say is that Morris High School in the Bronx, for example, should come under control of the community. I think that there should be a community school board that has virtually total power in that school system. I think that what's desperately needed is to make teachers accountable for their behavior.

Participant: Do you know what you're saying? You're saying that we teachers would have to give up some things that we've held very dear since the days of the depression.

Participant: But beyond this, I don't think you can hang the rap on teachers alone. You're going to have to blame principals, supervisors, assistant principals, guidance counselors -- you ought to see the kind of bastards those counselors are and the way they belittle and degrade children in the most subtle ways.

Participant: And more money, so they could get smaller groups so teachers could handle them.

Participant: One of the problems is, if I as a parent try to make a teacher accountable, the bureaucracy of the school system in my own community is so beautifully tuned to me; they've learned how to handle sophisticated, well-educated parents. But somehow or other we have to make the profession accountable for its own work. People who engage in malpractice have got to be stopped. And Mr. Chambers said, "If we don't do it ourselves, then somebody else ought to come along and do it for us." It's needed. In the Morris High School, malpractice flourishes everywhere, as it does in any other ghetto school. It's not as visible in the suburban school but it's there too.

Chairman: But isn't the present tendency of teachers to say, "Let's get together with solidarity in our union or professional organization and see to it that no teacher is fired, see to it that the community does not take over control of the schools?"

Participant: That was a factor in unionization of teachers five years ago. I've become very, very concerned about the turn the question has taken now. Five years ago when the U. F. T. was beginning to gain its power I was in contact with a good many graduate students that I had who were in the leadership of the fight to unionize the teachers in New York City. I backed them, but I then pleaded with them. "Maybe you have to use unionization tactics as they've been used everywhere. But for God's sake don't lose sight of the fact that you cannot follow the unionization model all the way if you're going to try to maintain the sense of professionalism. And for God's sake build into your system a capacity for self-policing, because if you don't, you're going to lose too much." They didn't. But I think that something that is very necessary here is to study unionization processes in education. I don't think we know enough about the problem. Teachers who are just beginning to get decent money have to organize power blocs. And this is what a union is.

However, given the reality of the circumstances in large cities with school faculties, school staffs, I don't know if you can have the organizing capacity, the capacity to draw together a group in a teachers' union at the same time that you attempt to make it police itself. I think one may cut the other one down. So maybe there is a generation problem here. I don't know. I've never had a chance to talk to Albert Shanker, but this is something I'd like to really pin him down with. I know this, that Albert Shanker is not nearly so unsophisticated that he doesn't know about these things. But he is assuming a role. He has to be a symbol of "solidarity forever" for the teachers and he will defend any "qualified" teacher that the court says is qualified to teach in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville School. He has to defend them. If he doesn't, his union is shot to pieces.

Participant: How do you define "malpractice" in the classroom? Is somebody watching in the class?

Participant: I'll give you an example. A teacher that I know was in the teachers' room every time I ever saw her. The reason she was in the teachers' room was that she could see down the hall and see into her classroom; she'd stand at the door with a cup in her hand or a cigarette in her hand, and she would watch to see if anything was happening in the classroom. If a noise started up, she'd run down the hall and scream at them, and then come back to the teacher's room. That's all she did.

Participant: I think the thing that bothers me is that we can do so much psychologically to injure the child in his attempt even to try.

Participant: Some teachers do that. And this has happened to one of my children; that's why it upsets me. She has gotten the attitude now that "What's the use, I can't get it anyway." And I have had to work at home with her to get her even to attempt to try.

Participant: But I think that you can determine malpractice -- obviously, the hitting of a child, the absenteeism from the classroom: some teachers send a student teacher in and then they're never in the classroom. Of course you learn not to send students there. We spend an awful lot of time talking about lists of teacher competencies, and I'm tired of lists of teacher competencies. We really don't look at the negative things.

Participant: Let's take it another way. It's not so much a question of proof. But in my community there are teachers who are so bad that every parent in the community that has a child coming within range of this woman starts praying that the kid isn't going to end up in that teacher's class. And that old bitch has been there for twenty-five years. Now, if you had community control, we wouldn't have to play games about "how do you define malpractice?" In business, you don't make definitions of incompetence, you just say, "Look man, you're not producing, you draw your pay at the end of this month and you're through."

Chairman: How about starting with turning the schools over to the community in the obviously underclass, underrepresented, neighborhoods if you are afraid of your own affluent neighborhoods? If you are afraid of the conservative forces that won't let you teach, why not start with community control in poor areas since apparently the grossest abuses are in these poor neighborhoods? We don't find ourselves able professionally to attack it any other way; why not let those neighborhoods permit the people who have no voice in controlling their communities to have something to say about what goes on in the schools as an experiment? And is there any way we could stop our professional organizations from clobbering every effort at community control?

Participant: I think you make a good case for community control, and then I think of the poor people in Appalachia and what it apparently means now. They have community control.

Chairman: They don't have, in the situation that Miss Easterling was talking about. She wasn't talking about community control, she was talking about control by the political power structure, which is quite another matter. It's the difference between saying, "Let the parents decide what they want taught in the schools," and saying, "Let the sheriff and a few other top politicians determine what can be taught in the schools."

Participant: Maybe community control is the right solution sometimes, but the basic problem under community control is the fact that we as a profession have never taken time out to complete the job of education by talking with parents, and playing the dual role and interpreting what we're trying to do and listening to what their reactions are and working it out this way.

Chairman: That's the problem, but we aren't ready to give that solution. And since we aren't ready to bring in the solution, why not let the parents work at the solution? We are the problem, there's no question about that; our failure to do our jobs is the problem.

Participant: I think one of the steps that we could take right now is each of us begin to take the initiative to make those contacts with the community, to establish that as a part of the model of teacher behavior.

Chairman: May I suggest that there are two ways there. You're talking about beginning to make the contact, and that's fine. But may I suggest that we might also need to begin to be willing to receive the contact as the people from the community approach us, because in these black communities which are still dominated by white faculties, there are very very soon going to be urgent pushes from the community, from parents who are just tired of what's happening to their children. And a lot of us are going to have to do something with ourselves in order to be able to receive these people well. They have never been received well before by the schools. Most of them have to be urged to go near the schools. But if they come not talking as we're used to expecting poor people and black people to talk -- humbly, if they come with a manner that says, "I demand," are we going to respond as so many of us responded yesterday to Mr. Chambers by saying, "Now you shouldn't come with that manner that alienates." Or are we going to listen?

Participant: As Dean Griffiths points out, community control is a two-edged sword. For example, the Navajo situation where very obviously the community had no voice and very much deserved and needed one. But there are communities, and a very obvious example is the South, where if you had a great deal of community control, you would have what we see represented in The Thunderbolt, or you might have at least a very strong element of it. So that just to say community control, in a very generalized sense, is something that is very good is not discriminated enough.

Chairman: We've already got a kind of community control. Let's not kid ourselves. We've got control by certain people in the community who always run things and whom the teachers kowtow to. And what you're resisting really is even the idea that some other people in the community should have an element in the control. You always bring up this issue of the two-edged sword.

Participant: If you really are concerned about the way kids learn and ought to learn, if you say that they ought to be engaged in discussions and examination of issues and examining the values that people hold underneath and then exploring which values seem to be most important and why, if this is crucial for kids' maturing, the community control ought not be able to turn off that process. Now there may be some ways that we interact that we need to work on. I agree with what you want to do, but I'm not sure that community control is the answer in every sense.

Chairman: I understand that it's a danger. But we're responding to the danger by shutting out the possibility. We've done it a number of times. Dean Griffiths kept doing it.[1]

You're afraid of it because it's dangerous, but why not give it a chance and work with it so as to help control it so it's not the wrong kind? For example, in the Woodlawn Project the University is a part, but not the only one with a voice at this time. The University and T. W. O. and one other agency.

---

[1] Cf. Dean Griffith's discussion with Representative Ernest Morial, infra.

Participant: Having lived in the South or in a border state for a little while, I certainly am sensitive to the kind of small town political structure that controls everything, and how incredibly difficult it is to break it down. But it may not be the question of doubting the potential of community control so much as searching for ways in which you can make this a viable process. I don't know if you could do it in Savannah; you'd just get killed in that town. It's so tightly held.

In a sense this is what Saul Alinsky is trying to do, for good or for bad: it is his effort to try to help "people" become a relevant power group. And if you believe that generally the people seek something like the good, if you can get sufficient numbers of power groups so that they check and balance each other, then you can begin to come to a viable notion of local control or community control. The other way to look at it is that perhaps we should redefine our sense of what "the community" is, in that even in Savannah the black ghetto, and it's a huge one, should be defined as a community. Maybe somehow we should learn how to help this community organize itself in such a way that it can command control of its own area at least. It should be encouraged gradually to develop political sophistication -- the awareness of how political power operates in local conflict. It's a question of learning how to use what we hope is a viable system. It's a system that has grown from the time of the Greeks: a principle of -- I almost hesitate to use the word anymore -- democracy is called for.

Chairman: It is, I think a large part, a matter of definition. And when you take community control as a bugaboo you can define it by saying local control has been horrible in certain communities. But if we understand by community control, control by the people of the community and not by just a few kingpins who are already controlling it, actually then community control is not the same kind of threat, anyhow. I also am from a border state. I've been there a long time, and I have witnessed the resistance to "community development" which came through anti-poverty programs which were designed to aid the community development of ordinary poor folks in Appalachia. When they began to get together and figure out what they wanted and ask the political power structure for certain things they had a right to, then there began to be in those communities a great attack on the anti-poverty program. Community development was leading to efforts at community control -- control by people, a lot of people.

The poor folks in their own communities wanted to have something to say about what went on in their communities. Such control is not the same thing as having the Birch Society dictate what happens. It's not the same thing as having a few politicians destroy what this young woman from Kentucky was trying to develop. And I find most of the people who are attacking the idea of community control using these horrible examples to define community control in order to frighten us away from it.

Participant: There are many types of communities. In the area of the Woodlawn Project we have a group of people who have been denied any voice in their schools. But for example, in Savannah you suggest there's a large enclave of poor people who have no control over their schools. Now obviously they deserve and ought to have control over their schools. But somewhere in that city there is probably a large group which would believe (or believe to some degree) the sort of stuff that we see in The Thunderbolt. Now do we say these people also have the right to control their schools?

Participant: Yes.

Participant: Well, do they though? I don't want to concede that they do, because I don't want that sort of thing taught in their schools.

Participant: But it already is.

Chairman: There seems to be, I think, a consensus on two or three points. One of them, I think, is that we do want to retain the privileges we've had all along of determining goals and methods -- of controlling the schools -- but we recognize that in order to do so we need to do a much better job of training ourselves to be fit to do this. And also, we need to find a way of assuming responsibility for policing the profession so that those persons who are either incompetent or engaged in various kinds of malpractices can be eliminated by us.

Participant: I'm not sure that this is a point of disagreement in terms of local control as mentioned by Mrs. Bufford. I think that I can go along with that if we would say that the decision should be made in terms of the individual setting.

Chairman: But determining it in terms of the individual setting would be done by the teachers, right? In other words, you're still leaving it to the teachers to determine whether the people in the community are the kind of "responsible people" they want to listen to.

Participant: I think I sense that most of us recognize the value of community control, community involvement, in decision-making, regarding the functioning of schools in their respective communities. We probably have some reservations about how well this will function given the political realities that exist in various communities. We don't have much to do about whether local school control is going to come or not. I think this is quite outside the professions. I think the black communities, for example, are going to take control. I certainly hope they do.

Participant: And the extent to which they control well will determine the growth of the movement. And the extent to which they destroy what exists and make it worse will destroy the possibilities of the movement's growing.

Chairman: Is it not also true, that the extent to which the black communities do it well will in a large part be determined by the way in which we receive their attempt?

Participant: In part. But I think their effectiveness is going to determine the success of the movement.

Chairman: If they have to fight us to be effective, it will be harder for them to do their job. If we will co-operate with them in order to help them to be effective, won't it be easier for them to do a good job?

Participant: They should have the complete support of the profession. We've been talking about community involvement, parent involvement and I want to get back to the matter of student involvement in planning. I wonder if we are as willing to recognize a need to involve the students much more than we generally do, as we have recently been willing to recognize the need to involve parents more.

Participate: I think that's education in itself. That's what the educational process is all about -- helping kids to make decisions, because they're going to have to. As we have been doing it, we make all the decisions and then at age eighteen we turn them out and say, "Now, you're all ready to participate."

Chairman: So when we say we want to help them we really mean we want to help them to help themselves. We want to help them to educate themselves, not to be educated by us.

Colonialism and Paternalism in the Disciplines -- American Higher Education and American Children

Mr. Paul Ward
Executive Secretary, American Historical Association

Paul Ward assisted in the formulation of the Tucson position of the National Triple T advisory committee -- a position which is represented in the introduction to this volume. Specifically, he defined for that committee the four areas to which its deliberations and decisions seemed to have relevance.

Mr. Ward speaks here, as he does generally, as a representative of the academic disciplines.

His notion that the disciplines have fostered various sorts of "colonialism" is not new; a far more radical Frantz Fanon wrote during the Algerian rebellion against colonialism of the connection between what Algerian Higher Education was and what Algeria was. One of Fanon's most striking examples is Algerian psychology's discovery that the Algerian native is a lobotomized European:

> We shall here quote the main works on this subject (North African criminality) by the psychiatric school of the faculty of Algiers. The conclusions of the researches carried on for over twenty years were, let us recall to mind, the subject of authoritative lectures from the Chair of Psychiatry.
>
> It is thus that Algerian doctors who are graduates of the faculty of Algiers are obliged to hear and learn that the Algerian is a born criminal. Moreover, I remember certain among us who in all sincerity upheld and developed these theories that they had learned. They even added "It's a hard pill to swallow, but it's been scientifically established."
>
> The North African likes extremes, so we can never entirely trust him. Today he is the best of friends, tomorrow the worst of enemies. He is insensible to shades of meaning, and Cartesianism is fundamentally foreign to him; the sense of balance, the weighing and pondering of an opinion or action clashes with his most intimate nature. The North African is a violent person . . . . We find him incapable of self-discipline, or of canalising his impulses.

But we must be precise. This impulsiveness is largely aggressive and generally homocidal. It is in this fashion that we come to explain the unorthodox behavior of the Algerian who is a prey to melancholia. The French psychiatrists. . . .were accustomed when dealing with a patient subject to melancholia to fear that he would commit suicide. Now the melancholic Algerian takes to killing. This illness of the moral consciousness, which is always accompanied by auto-accusation and autodestructive tendencies, took on in the case of Algerians heterodestructive forms. The melancholic Algerian does not commit suicide. He kills.

For Professor Porot (of the Algerian School of Psychologists), the life of the native of North Africa is dominated by diencephalic urges. It is as much as to say that in a way the native North African is deprived of a cortex. Professor Porot does not shrink from this contradiction and in April, 1939, in the "Southern Medical and Surgical Gazette" he states precisely, in collaboration with his pupil Sutter who is at present professor of psychiatry in Algiers: "Primitivism is not a lack of maturity nor a marked stoppage in the development of the intellectual psychism. It is a social condition which has reached the limit of its evolution; it is logically adopted to a life different from ours." Finally, the professors come to the very basis of the doctrine; "This primitivism is not merely a way of living which is the result of a special upbringing; it has much deeper roots. We even consider that it must have its substratum in a particular predisposition of the architectonic structure, or at least in the dynamic hierarchisation of the nervous centers. We are in the presence of a coherent body of comportment and of a coherent life which can be explained scientifically. The Algerian has no cortex: or, more precisely, he is dominated, like the inferior vertebrates, by the diencephalon. The cortical functions, if they exist at all, are very feeble, and are practically unintegrated into the dynamic of existence." There is thus neither mystery nor paradox. The hesitation of the colonist in giving responsibility to the native is not racism nor paternalism, but quite simply a scientific appreciation of the biologically limited possibilities of the native.

The remarks of an Algerian psychologist and of Mr. Chambers' Thunderbolt magazine serve much the same function vis-á-vis the dominent social group. American history, and particularly American historical textbooks, have served similar functions.

In the paper which follows, Mr. Ward speaks as a man who has known British colonialism, and who is a serious scholar in History and administrator for historians. He indicates where he personally sees the academic disciplines as having failed schools and "outsiders' communities." He treats the four areas treated by the TTT advisory committee in its group paper (power, academic content, reward systems in education, education's meaning to people). While his elegant prose, and his natural gentility of manner may obscure for the reader the bite of his message, it ought not to. Were Paul Ward's position taken seriously by American universities (as they seek -- or represent themselves as endeavoring to seek -- the good of American schools and communities), America would be different.

Colonialism and Paternalism in the Disciplines -- American Higher Education and American Children

Paul Ward
American Historical Assocation

This has been a year of anger in education, as well as in politics and the streets. In our political world, I fear the anger has chiefly destroyed lines of communication. But in education, as sometimes happens in family circles, the angry outbursts have helped a number of us face up to shortcomings we might have recognized long ago.

My title for this afternoon comes right out of one such educational argument last spring, and the consequence of that argument has been that I've been thinking along new lines ever since. If some of you who know about that argument, find in what follows less anger than the title leads you to expect, that is because I think I understand better now the realities of the matter and where to focus on what can be done; which means, as a matter of fact, that I'll be focusing more on the relation between the disciplines and higher education and the teachers than on the children, because I think we can't get through to the children directly. Also, if you find my argument less clear than you'd like it to be, that's because the argument is still for me a new focus of thinking, one not fully thought through.

Now higher education and the disciplines, (my field of history is only one of them of course) have been charged with "paternalism," "colonialism," and other sorts of unpleasant stances -- in their relations with both teachers and children in the schools. I grant the justice of the charges, especially because I have lived and worked in the colonialist world overseas and know how subtle colonialism can be and how hard it is to counteract its bad effects with even the most massive good intentions and the most monumental good achievements. If the colonialist behavior of higher education were attributable only to the self-interest of professors and the short-sightedness of their institutions, I should have nothing very interesting to talk about; instead, if my lifetime of observing it has not been wasted, it's also, and centrally I think, based on what I shall call this afternoon "the dilemma of knowing more in education." If you know considerably more than others do in a given learning situation, you are very likely to think you know better.

Now there's some substantial reason for this dilemma. Good education, as contrasted with trivial learning, is always pointing on to the next higher level of understanding and to broader significances.

Unlike learning to jump rope or do crossword puzzles, the learning of mathematics or literature is at every level an opening of new doors on to further worlds of achievement or experience. Even if your youngsters are not likely ever to study astronomy again, the bits of astronomy you may find yourself helping them learn one afternoon need to be the real thing, so that years later in choosing leisure-time reading, they can better spot the glib and fraudulent, or so that if they meet an astronomer next year, they can venture a question or two as truly at their level and as 'members of his club.' Without this door-opening relation to some further level or range of learning and understanding, I would contend, any bit of education is sterile, and justified only as an isolated tool or momentary pleasure. The person who knows far more about what's beyond the door or doors does know part of what's essential for the present moment of education. But it's equally true in education that the present experience of learning must not be subordinated to what is beyond the door. Otherwise the present learning is likely to be rushed through too fast or superficially, to be reduced to rote learning, or at least not allowed its independent satisfactions.

As I recall from my own experiences, the intensive preparatory course more often than not has been poor preparation. Those who know more do not automatically know better. Even the natural scientist whose subject in the university is changed most drastically, faces this dilemma when he enters the school situation, and men like Jerrold Zacharias understand this. In fact if I'm not mistaken, the dilemma in its present dimensions is a novelty in our land.

When I was in school, the university expert only here and there was treated by other Americans with enough respect to be tempted to think he knew better how the schools should teach. A common sneer was in the air: "If you're so smart, how come you're not rich?" Undergraduates in the 1920's were amateurs in the classroom, relaxed and easily sceptical of their professors' values, since what was really important for most of them went on in the fraternity house and on the football field. I can remember it vividly. Higher education and the disciplines in those days could not be colonialist or paternalist about anything much. Now, however, they are taken more seriously. I can say this despite the deep groundswell this autumn of public suspicion and criticism against them. Colonialism of any sort becomes destructive when the second parties sincerely believe that "the others with their advantages" automatically know better.

But perhaps this is to say that the dilemma I'm talking about inheres in successful education when extended over several levels. When education does its job well, its most highly trained practitioners are likely to command real respect and their dilemma of knowing more becomes real. The schools want no more teaching of nineteenth-century science, and any man who knows more is put in the position of knowing better. What he recommends authoritatively is most easily taught authoritarianly. Then those youngsters who can least readily adapt are held more curtly to higher standards and their chances at self-respect and their opportunity to learn are destroyed by the new colonialist or paternalist pressures. What can higher education and the disciplines do about this? I see four things they can do, all very much in line with their proper duties:

I. First, they must take seriously their working relationship, limited as it is, and must be 'with' what goes on in the schools. Not many professors will ever have the abilities and personal motivations to be Jerrold Zachariases on even the most modest scale. But more scholars can be brought to accept the seriousness of the work attempted by the few of reinterpreting the richness of their advanced fields for through-the-door guidance of less complex levels of understanding and also for adjustment to the tastes of the new generation. A more general attitude of serious concern for the relation to the schools can be built up. Scholars with prestige, tempted to think they automatically know better, need at least this much encouragement to keep their ears somewhat open to what those actually in the schools are saying about problems and possibilities. Many disciplines I grant, through their learned associations, are now doing something as a gesture in this direction. But a colonialist relationship, even a potentially colonialist relationship, is one in which it's hard to hear or even voice protests loud enough against the insidious tendencies to "know better" for reasons of convenience and bias. Quiet reports cannot sufficiently illuminate the human realities of the situation, so flare-ups of indignation are needed and healthy, especially if they can be met with a response that, accepting that this is serious business, sets about some difficult and costly adjustment.

Perhaps this honesty of response is the nub of the matter. Most instances of rethinking and adjustment of standards by higher education and the disciplines toward the schools have been impelled by a sense of national need coupled with enthusiasm for the current character of the subject fields. It would be a novelty to alter part of such a scholarly program or to initiate another of the sort, primarily in response to the indignant representations by parents or school teachers in a particular area. Relations have been too disciplined. But chances of healthy outbursts having a response seem now a bit greater because of our present efforts and feelings about, for example, Negro history.

The easy response to protests, of course, is to disregard standards or lower them and to focus simply on re-establishing good communications. But the real opportunity, my experience with colonialist relationships tells me, is for the scholar to rethink afresh that about which he does know more, in close touch, close working touch, with the parents or teachers who *know* the human learning situation *better*. They themselves may then end up strengthened in the confidence that what he has to contribute is of value, and both he and they will understand that he does not globally "know better." This type of response by him is, I repeat, likely to be difficult and costly. But such responses properly reported can keep convincing the on-looking scholarly communities that their relationship to the schools is serious business worth keeping their ear open to.

Let me impose upon you a moment more to analytical. If my perception is correct, the scholar's function in working with the schools (the scholars from the discipline I'm talking about) *is to attend to the door-opening aspects of learning*. What needs clarification is the very limited special sense in which he operates in this area as an expert. Expertness in our world usually means a dividing up of decisions among several persons. And of course educational experts many times are indispensible. For the schools, unfortunately, the disciplinary scholar's expertness has usually gotten itself embodied in the textbook as an array of inert knowledge, whose usefulness depends in the last analysis on the schoolteacher's ability -- and this is quite a separate matter. But for any opening of the doors of learning ahead, the decisions of scholar and teacher can and should overlap and co-operate. The choice of materials to study and the procedure of studying are at bottom inseparable. The learning needs to catch up energies, now, in ways that will point on to what can be most satisfying at further levels of complexity and discrimination.

The very necessity to revise present materials and procedures is usually a mixture of changes in the way the advanced subject is now being understood and of changes in the new generation's awarenesses, and tastes and needs. Scholar and teacher have overlapping responsibilities here. For a subject like history, I feel strongly that nothing is more important than discussion questions, whether explicit or implicit, and that these will trigger fruitful historical thinking among the youngsters only if they embody the expertise of both the advanced scholar and the current teacher. Universities and scholarly associations now have a wide variety of specific arrangements for co-operating with developments in the schools; in most of these, the scholars are still too respectfully aloof from what goes on in the schools. What I am suggesting is emphasis on building up in them a real concern, regardless of the mechanisms.

The subtlety of colonialism as I'm using the term, is that it flourishes despite good mechanisms and is usually only nourished by good intentions and impressive expertness. But the genius of good education at all levels is that it keeps reviving the participants' good sense. What matters is *what the youngsters get out of it all*. They deserve the best they can get. Concern for such human realities is very much in the central tradition of higher education. When such concern is expressed, the disciplines themselves are the better for it, and the disciplines likewise can take more seriously their work in relation to the schools.

II. The second thing that higher education and the disciplines can do, I feel, is a specific application of that elaboration of my first point, which led me to suggest that our job in working with the schools is to help see to it that knowledge opens doors but to recognize at the same time that we do not know all there is to know about how it opens them: to recognize as far as possible and help remove from formulations of subject matter any implicit assumptions that the scholar's own class and subculture are intrinsically superior. This requires constant and deliberate effort. Standard English, to take the example that's been most discussed, is a tool every child ideally should be helped to master and certainly a convenience in most classrooms; but while we 'help,' it is necessary that we make an effort to keep showing respect for alternatives, for it is effortful business. The earnest concern that American public schools be a melting pot for immigrant children is too close in our very recent past. Every American community is under its own pressure to push on its schools the taks of socializing its young (from instilling in them whatever its own unquestioned values may be all the way through to driver-training). Higher education and the disciplines are, in the nature of things, freer from such pressures. So I feel in their cooperation with the schools, they have an obligation to direct attention to such things as the human validity of minority dialects, or the rich expressiveness of colloquialisms that rely more on manner and gesture than on dictionary nuances. The teacher deserves an ally for his or her moments of generous rebelling against the community pressures to socialize, moments of wanting the youngsters to have some breathing room in perspective against blanketing incentives to conformity.

Nineteen-sixty-eight, our year, is just over three centuries since Molière put on his play ridiculing the preciousness and delicate sensibilities of the newly emerging middle class. And for many years now, our novels and plays have been responding vividly to our century's middle-class hunger to know about harsh realities -- at least, vicariously. And our schools? It may be enough to suggest that children must not be raised completely in cotton wool. Some of the things that we've said this morning are not things for all classrooms. The challenge to scholar and teacher together, however, is to find the right variety of ways to allude to or present what is "not approved," so that it may be grasped in its authenticity and strength and contribute to the youngsters' growth toward independent perceptiveness and responsible value judgements. Part of this challenge may be to build into science materials some overtones of the right kind of respect for science fiction, perhaps even for astrology. American history needs at least some intimations of the darker sides of what our national heroes may have in their biographies, or least of what the loyalists felt about the treaty Benjamin Franklin concluded with France after Saratoga or of how the non-Yankees behaved and suffered in California during the Gold Rush. The present eagerness to add the black's view of things to our history must, that is, become fully catholic in its perceptions of how life has been for underdogs, or it will become simple sentimentalism and help to corrupt our standards rather than to clarify our insights. Higher education itself stands to gain from a more serious effort to disengage our fields of study from the accidents of our comfortable establishment cultures that we may better root them in the human perspectives of man as man.

III. Now the third thing that higher education and the disciplines can do, and must do I think, is to throw the weight of their influence against the current over-valuing of grades and I. Q.'s and class standings. Just as present conditions are making education in our country a much more powerful engine for socializing youngsters, irrespective of their feelings, the educational structure is being used, relied upon more than ever before in history, as a screening device to decide who'll be allowed to rise into positions of status and power. I would argue that the educational system works now as a screening device partly because the reliance on objective testing and grades and the rest has given it in our generation a measure of openness for youngsters, who in earlier times could never have gone on through to higher education; but this has only made things harder for youngsters often equally ambitions, who are not temperamentally equipped to play the role of the diligent, 'learned,' acquiescent young scholar. These youngsters of whom I speak and all who have come to sympathize with them, instinctively rebel against or make nonsense of the rigidities of the grading system, so that some good colleges have already begun to make some adjustments in response.

These youngsters are rebellious, of course, because grading systems such as ours are an anomaly in the context of good education. Most of us recognize grades as on the one hand a great administrative convenience and on the other, if managed well by the individual teacher, a useful adjunct to the setting of specific tasks and deadlines for individual study. In this latter sense, they are artificial; and so the resultant grades should then vary from teacher to teacher and from class to class. The need for this arbitrariness conflicts with the pressure for equality of justice in the total screening process. The disciplines should be ready to join enlightened educators at all other levels to acknowledge the discomfort of this tension between instructional tools and justice for youngsters' careers.

But it is easy enough for the graduate school professoriate to join in criticisms of the educational arrangements which produce their students. What is more to my point is the need for such professors to give what attention they can to the possibilities of individualizing the study of their subjects at lower levels of instruction. The possibilities for alternative choices of emphasis for problem solving that will stimulate youngsters discovering their own abilities and interests, the special projects that may be pursued -- these should benefit from attention by every scholar who is ready to work with other educators familiar with the realities in the schools. Attention to these practical possibilities can be the best of indications to teachers and students that the latter's grades on the standard exams are not the only things that matter for the subject at the level of higher education, nor even the most important. At the same time, higher education and the disciplines must watch with great interest and modesty the outcome of current experiments of admitting to college students who do not meet ordinary standards. Each discipline has new things to discover about the complex set of qualities needed for success in its own endeavors. The screening process at present seems to test few of these, and well-considered experiments to break the limitations of screening may bring into clearer focus some intellectual and aesthetic powers and qualities of personal stance that are important for discipline at all levels. We're only beginning to know what we need to know about all this.

IV. *The fourth thing that higher education and the disciplines can do is probably the most important: to give attention to the way in which intrinsic and extrinsic rewards of learning in fact shape the process of learning.* Good education as I understand it -- this will not surprise you after what I've said -- is in part a leading of young minds into new worlds of reality, ones to which they would otherwise be insensitive and ignorant. Higher education has traditionally emphasized the intrinsic rewards of such new fields of study, as contrasted with extrinsic rewards. Here I'm thinking of extrinsic rewards such as the unexpected usefulness of a bit of information for current topical conversation among age-mates, the future use of what is learned for a possible paying job -- the paying job ahead -- even the relevance of an issue encountered for a personal debate going on at that moment in the student's inner life. But many a subject of study has *in fact* itself been shaped by the choosing of items likely to have such extrinsic rewards. These rewards are, so to speak, buried in advance in the ground the students will go over, buried either by the teacher or by the literary artist for his readers, just as both of them have worked over the intrinsic rewards that are already there and to be discovered. The scholar should discuss all the potential rewards of a piece of work with the teacher, and the teacher should go over with the scholars some of the ways these rewards can best be handled when uncovered, if energies and understandings are to be directed so as subsequently to be most fruitful.

Now one recurrent difficulty between teacher and scholar is that when the teacher points out a reward or relevance that represents the youngster's awareness of current events or something in his current life, the scholar may feel that attention to it will only distort the subject under study, bending it to the service of mere current interests. It's then that the two really need to talk things out on an equal level. The raising of a distinction or two in the subject matter can possibly deepen the curiosity and respect of the students for it sufficiently, or the providing of background material may make what is in the subjects stand out as sufficiently important or humanly vivid, so that the youngsters' attention can be held firmly on the learning task in hand. Then the academic subject will simply be energized and enriched by their awareness of its live relevance, the sense that it belongs in the real world.

Now the scholar in such cases should face frankly, and this may require special study that has not been done, the extent to which even the intrinsic satisfactions they see in their subjects are rewards that have been buried by previous generations of scholars, in response to the extrinsic conditions of the lives back then. A little investigation of this sort should make it easier for him to see the possibilities of mutual adjustment between what was so satisfying and educationally fruitful for students in the past, and the interests and sensitivities of the present generation. I could name many fields of history that now seem dead, but whose lifeblood of the past strikes me as available for this transfusion into the veins of our technology oriented and whole world oriented present. Military history, unromanticized in these days of Viet Nam tragedy, may serve as one suggested example.

The disciplines should be better able to recognize the value of a richness and range of rewards from study. They may be better able to do this, as they become clearer about the ways in which teachers have always been able to keep such rewards at the service of maximum progress in learning. This is a complex matter, of course. In mathematics, as I understand it, there is a serious problem as to when students should be deterred from visualizing in convenient images what they must learn to do in its own terms and, alternatively, when they should be encouraged to visualize and in what fashion, so as to develop their intuitive grasp of the mathematical elements. Clarifying visualizations of abstract matters are closely akin to the intellectual rewards in my terms. In more explicitly humanistic subjects like my own, I'm sure it helps to arrange for rewards of sharply contrasting types to be simultaneously in the background of the students' minds, to give them the fullest sense of power and freedom as they study. The reward of one item of study may be some immediate applicability of the information to their daily affairs, at the same time that an adjoining item may open up their imaginative awareness of a poignant human problem, an awareness drawing the child himself out of himself. Many of the devices used by earnest school teachers to maintain student interest in the past have been sterile and stultifying. Without careful thought and careful listening to teachers, I am persuaded, scholars are not likely to be able to say why. A prolonged and mutually perceptive collaboration between scholar and teacher might for example, have been able to tell my first high school history teacher why his having us draw political cartoons of crisis moments in Greek history was such emphatically bad teaching practice for history.

But these are considerations that above all lead to possibilities for meeting our present colonialist crisis. The failure of established academic materials to interest youngsters from the ghetto or alienated suburban boys is, I am arguing, directly in the center of education's main line of responsibility. These students, I am convinced, deserve and can respond to material that yields rewards, helping them see more clearly the subtleties and realities of power relationships between generations and in government structures. They need and deserve the rewards in work that exposes, for their understanding and use, the senses in which all men are brothers and yet that each man lives and dies to himself and for eternity. The rewards of purely practical usefulness may need to be drastically revised with almost a complete change of appearances, so that these youngsters of whom I speak may feel that in accepting them, they're responding on their own to reality, rather than responding to a drill master of the establishment. But higher education and the disciplines will be grasping better their central character, if these improvements are made.

So I've spoken of four things which I feel higher education and the disciplines can do to help meet the present crisis of colonialist pressures and the resistance to them of those who are not 'insidious,' educationally speaking. We can take more seriously and discriminatingly their working relationship with the schools. We can see that our subject matter carries more touches of underdog views and more of the disengagement that will really offset establishment assumptions. We can throw our weight against mechanical ranking systems and in favor of rewards to individualized and honest learning. We can be more deliberately careful to provide for students at every level a full range of rewards likely to catch the learner's honest interests and direct them aright for further learning. My slant on all this may sound Utopian, but times are changing; many good scholars are stirred by student troubles and ghetto distress to pay more attention to the human realities of teaching.

What I see emerging these days, or at least ahead of us, as a possible corrective to colonialist tendencies will be a new area of specialization for scholarship, that is the door-opening aspects of fully successful teaching at all the different levels. These are the aspects of what Jerome Bruner calls "structure," which the scholar can deal with. Talk about marrying content and method may remain empty, unless some sustained scholarly attention begins to overlap and cooperate with the expertness of teachers on this matter of structure and its handling at the level of implementation. But to say this may be to bring to your minds the strongest objection to my whole approach. The more lofty reaches of higher education and of the disciplines are characteristically concerned with the frontiers of knowledge. I've been using the word 'scholar' deliberately, for it implies someone who is actively concerned with what goes on at these frontiers, even if he's not spending time there. Does this concern of his and his enthusiasm over the latest findings have anything to do with effective instruction and learning at less advanced levels? My strong feeling is that the answer is "yes." I have of course no proof. Learning is a process, though, and the process at its best is a grappling with reality to perceive and understand it better. Those who are engaged in this effort most dramatically and keenly tend to be those out at the frontiers. And to cut youngsters away from a sense of fellowship with them is to rob their present moment of learning of part of its essential dignity. In my own experience of teaching, my bringing in at the right point, when students are feeling they've got hold of something serious -- they're getting somewhere -- an unobtrusive mention of dissimilar results of some similar exciting research, has always seemed a needed filling out of the learning experience of the moment, not a decorative frill. But here I'm once more admitting that the teaching is in the hands of the teacher. There are many other frontiers than this one I've just been speaking of, such as the community frontier, that may be far more important to the teaching job.

If higher education and the disciplines can see more clearly how limited a role they should play, not one of authoritative expertness but of cooperation on certain essential aspects of the teaching process, perhaps teachers can come more than half the way and make the working relationship really work. The initiative comes best from the teacher's side, since the final decisions and execution are theirs. If they take the lead more often and the results are good, the problem of colonialist pressure from higher education and the disciplines ought to dwindle to the vanishing point.

Now I'm not sure I've persuaded you to answer with a "yes" Donald Bigelow's question of this morning, "Should the university be allowed to continue in this connection?", but I have presented an argument "yes," if the colonialism of the university of higher education and the disciplines can be evaded.

Professional Competence, The American Community, and the Responsibility of the School of Education

Dean Daniel E. Griffiths
NYU, School of Education

Dean Daniel E. Griffiths is the Dean of Education at one of the three universities participating in the Tri-University Project. As such, he had a good deal to do with the genesis of the project, and he has had much to do with its continuing development.

Dean Griffiths chose to announce a position which was not popular with everyone at the Minneapolis conference and particularly not popular with the representatives of the various "community" and cultural enclaves invited to the conference to speak concerning their sense of what education, teachers and the teaching of teachers ought to be (cf. Dean Griffiths exchange with Representative Morial and the resolutions of the "community" representatives, infra). Minority positions are not wrong by virtue of their being "minority" positions and it is particularly important that one bear this in mind in reading Dean Griffiths' remarks. Griffiths had too often spoken with contempt of those who belong to one or another establishment or ride one or another bandwagon to be particularly bothered by being in the minority. He has often been -- perhaps even sought to be -- a minority voice among those who lead Schools of Education. He became at Minneapolis a "minority" among "minorities." It becomes the more important that one understand just what Dean Griffiths said.

Griffiths said, if I understand his exchange with Representative Morial correctly, that not all communities have the good sense, the inner need, or the respect for intellectual honesty and for intellectual and political freedom to bear a significant role in the management of schools, the shaping of curricula, or the training of teachers. Consequently, in some communities, the professional ought to insist on ultimate control. The position of the "community" representatives who were at the conference -- if I read the small group sessions correctly -- was precisely the opposite. They said that, in their experience, respect for intellectual honesty (e. g. in textbooks) and for intellectual and political freedom (e. g. in classroom discussions of hot issues) have not been the hallmarks of the College of Education or of the professional teacher or administrator; they said that the history of education in California or the South, at Rough Rock or the North Side or Woodlawn, bear witness to this.

Dean Griffiths' other argument, with respect to the "professionalization" of the Schools of Education, speaks for itself. They obviously need to be competent. Griffiths describes how they might become so.

Professional Competence, The American Community and the Responsibility of the School of Education

Daniel E. Griffiths
New York University

I am very pleased to be able to discuss schools of education with you today. Many of us have begun to devote our time and our energies to a rethinking of the school of education: its role in the American university, its relationship to the field, its students, its professors, its curriculum, in fact, every aspect of the school. It has been suggested that this paper might focus on the question, "What can schools of education do to make themselves as necessary to the development of a teacher who is a craftsman as a medical school or a law school is to the development of a lawyer or a doctor who knows his job?" If I might be allowed to tidy-up the sentence and change a few words so that the charge might be contained in two questions: How can schools of education differ from the better schools of law and medicine? How can schools of education prepare practitioners who are as professionally competent as are graduates of schools of law and medicine? then I accept the mission.

I am not, however, going to naively assume that all schools of education produce gross incompetents and schools of law and medicine gifted practitioners. Some schools of education are producing modern Montessoris and some schools of medicine and law produce those who either bury their patients or incarcerate their clients. A drug salesman once told me of his experience in attempting to sell a doctor a new miracle drug. He met complete defeat, the doctor simply would not buy the new drug. The salesman then "studied" the doctor and found that he was a Princeton graduate. On his next call to the doctor he brought the miracle drug in black and orange capsules and made an immediate sale.

With this disclaimer, however, I now turn to the topic and submit this thesis to answer the first question:

Schools of education are not comparable to the advanced professional schools such as law and medicine because they have failed to develop beyond the first stage in the evolution of a professional school.

In order to see what this means let us review briefly the developed modern schools of education.

University Schools of Education

Schools of education have been the object of controversy almost from the day they were conceived and the controversy has not yet abated. Setting aside the objections of crackpots, self-proclaimed experts, and other poorly informed biased critics is there anything to the oft-mounted attacks on schools of education?

University schools of education came to their present state through a series of historical accidents and *ad hoc* arrangements. Public education got off to a sorry start as can be seen by reading Hofstadter in his book, *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*. He described the position of the teacher in the United States by refering to stories which appeared in the popular press. In 1776, the *Maryland Journal* advertised that a ship had just arrived at Baltimore from Dublin and Cork, and enumerated among its products for sale, "various Irish commodities, among which are school masters, beef, pork, and potatoes." Of particular relevance is the comment of a Delaware minister who observed, around 1725, that "when a ship arrives in the river, it is a common expression with those who stand in need of an instructor for their children, let us go and buy a school master." It was in the same century that the Connecticut Press printed an advertisement offering a reward for a runaway described as "a school master, of a pale complexion, with short hair. He has the itch very bad, and sore legs." Far into the 19th Century it was possible to find such comments as this: "the man who was disabled to such an extent that he could not engage in manual labor--who was lame, too fat, too feeble and had bad fits or who was too lazy to work--well, they usually made school masters out of these, and thus got what work they could out of them."

While it is certainly true that teachers are no longer viewed as they were in earlier days, the climate in which teachers work, the institutions which prepare and support them, and the perception of teachers held by the public today is strongly influenced by the conditions which existed at the conception, birth, and childhood of the teaching profession. If one cares to push the analogy to its logical conclusion, it can be said that teachers are now in their adolescence as they organize for collective negotiations. Their militance is long overdue and their adolescence has been delayed, but it is now here.

Schools were taught by the people described above by Hofstader, penurious clergymen, and lawyers and those who were waiting for marriage or some state of employment superior to what they there enjoyed. When the demand for teachers became so great that it could not be met by these *ad hoc* methods, normal schools were created.

These schools were modeled after the special and separate teacher-training institutions in England and France. No one seems able to explain the reason why this was done since early Americans were distainful of many other cultural and educational practices in Europe, but in retrospect this appears to have been a major error in judgement on the part of otherwise pioneering educators. All educational historians seem to agree that the normal school left much to be desired as a source of teachers. The terms "quality" is never used to describe the students, the teachers, the facilities, or the curriculum. The emphasis was always on "quantity," a value which has remained to the present time. Beggs summarized the approach employed by the normal schools as follows:

> 1. Make sure that the prospective teacher knows the fundamentals of what he proposes to teach, at least a little above the level of mastery he expects of his students.
>
> 2. Give him a little training in how to organize the subject matter and to plan his presentation.
>
> 3. Teach him a few formulas for managing a classroom situation and controlling students.
>
> 4. Wherever possible, let him observe an experienced teacher in action.
>
> 5. Have him teach under supervision for a time to get the actual feel of the situation and to gain the advantage of a more or less professional critique of his performance.

These standards remain as the format of modern teacher education programs with few variations, but one would hope, with a somewhat higher level of sophistication. The role of the teacher-trainer in normal school was to perform the functions described. Little or no mention is made of scholarly activity on the part of these people, no research is ever mentioned, and the process of teacher-education was rarely intellectualized.

The normal schools were scorned by professors in the liberal arts colleges and the general public held them in rather low regard. Butts and Cremin point out that although there were 167 public normal schools in 1898, little impact was apparent on the growing need for teachers. They estimated that far fewer than a third of the public school teachers had received normal school instruction. Butts and Cremin conclude, "It seems safe to assume that the overwhelming majority were appointed to teaching with little regard for their academic or professional training."

The normal school was created to fill a social need, but it was of such low quality that its impact on the development of the education profession was at best minimal, at worst negative. It was so recognized by both the informed and uninformed public.

Then we come to the formation of the first schools of education. The first of these was at Michigan and the second at New York University; this was at the turn of the century. These schools quickly adopted the attitudes and traditions of the normal school, largely because their professors and deans came from the public schools and/or the normal schools, but also because they had no more to teach than did the normal schools. Now that's the history; by the way, you don't find much more than that anywhere.

In trying to think through the state of schools of education, a comment credited to John Kenneth Galbraith seems appropriate. As a youth he was sent by his father to the Ontario Agricultural College to study animal husbandry. Speaking of his experience he said that he shortly discovered, "There was no such subject as animal husbandry." By this he no doubt meant that animal husbandry was not a discipline: (a) a unique way of approaching phenomena; (b) a comprehensible, manageable, and understandable body of content-knowledge. Animal husbandry was a practical art to be handed on from one practitioner to another. Galbraith solved this difficulty by studying agricultural economics.

The first problem confronting schools of education is there is no such subject as education. When Conant discovered this truth he advocated the elimination of most of the courses in teacher education: a cure analogous to strangling a baby because it has difficulty breathing. Nevertheless, observers of schools of education are struck by the lack of commonly accepted substance, of great variation in structure, and the almost universal absence of the production of new knowledge on the processes of teaching and learning. As a result, most schools of education through their professors pass on testimonials and folklore to students. The products of schools of education are much like so many of their professors, atheoretical, anti-intellectual, pragmatic, and above all practical. Therein lies the major reason for the sad state which public education finds itself in today. And this is as true in the Office of Education as it is in the 50 state education departments; as true in the cities as in the towns. This basic deadly weakness has prevented the university graduate schools of education from being the wellspring of knowledge, the developer of methodology, and the fountainhead of new ideas with which to regenerate the schools. Whereas many other professional schools such as law and medicine may be legitimately criticized as harboring "ivory tower dwellers" or "theorists" or "intellectuals" far out of touch with their practitioners this could not and cannot be a legitimate critism leveled against schools of education. In fact, the strength of medical schools lies partially in the fact that they have been able to retreat from the market place and perform a specified set of roles. Efforts to increase the number of roles played by medical schools are being resisted, and in words that are a lesson to schools of education; to quote from Irving Page's article, "Social Planning and Our Medical Schools:"

> Medical schools are in danger of becoming service organizations instead of gatherings of gifted persons living in an atmosphere of freedom, independence, and emotional quiet conducive to good pedagogy and research. They are expected to (I) teach medical students, (II) train paramedical students, (III) do the major part of medical research, (IV) conduct large programs of postgraduate education, (V) service many governmental committees and voluntary health organizations, and (VI) practice medicine. . .
>
> I am hoping that the "Ivory Tower" aspect of medical schools will not be destroyed and suggest that the necessary community social and medical functions can better be assumed by other existing agencies. I believe that it was a mistake to have saddled the medical schools with becoming the core of leadership for the Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke Regional Program. There is little to suggest that they are prepared for such responsibilities, nor should they be.

Because of the "practical" orientation of their professors and administrators, schools of education failed to relate to the practice of education in the way that schools of medicine, law, dentistry, and agriculture related to their practitioners. They failed and are failing largely because they have not developed normally. All of the successful professional schools have gone through developmental phases in which they began by employing gifted practitioners as professors. In these early stages, teaching was conceived as the transmission of practical judgment from the practitioner-professor to the practice-bound student. The most advanced professional schools have changed and ultimately taken on the character of large research institutes as well as of centers for advanced professional training, with many professors devoting major time to research and the development of theory based on this research. At this stage of things development in the professional school is viewed as the application of research findings to the problems of the profession.

The situation at New York University illustrates the difference between the schools of medicine and schools of education. The NYU School of Medicine is one of the most advanced professional schools in the world with $24,000,000 in research and training (the sixth largest amount in the country), a large university hospital, and a major teaching hospital. The School of Education, with roughly the same size faculty has $7,000,000 for research and training for 9,000 students with minimal specialized facilities. The ratio of approximately 3 1/2 to 1 is probably lower than the ratio in the rest of the country.

Professional preparation in education will continue to be seriously deficient until it first generates new knowledge relevant to the problems of the field, and second, incorporates knowledge to delineate professional functions and roles and to produce the behaviors essential to effective performance. To engage in teaching without the benefits of relevant new knowledge is merely to perpetuate non-functional or dysfunctional behavior and institutions, which is exactly what is happening today in schools of education. There is no school of education in the world which can be said to have achieved the advanced level of development of a first-rate professional school. Our schools of education are largely staffed by those who could be called "gifted practitioners," and most schools not only do not base their instruction in research-verified knowledge, they do not conduct research.

The first thing that schools of education across the country must do is to make up their minds to become full-fledged professional schools. In order to do this, they must accomplish four major points, which I would like to discuss in some detail. The first is that schools of education need to become graduate schools; second, they need to become research and development oriented; third, they must develop new relationships to the schools in the community, and fourth, new roles for professors of education must be developed.

Education of Teachers

First of all, there is the assumption that teacher education is preparation for a profession. Therefore, a school of education has to be conceived of as a professional school as for example the school of law, school of architecture, school of medicine, school of dentistry. Since teaching is even more an intellectual process than is the practice of medicine or the practice of law, the need for a liberal arts background is, of course, paramount. There would seem to be no question but that the student of education should enter a liberal arts program and gain for himself the background necessary to communicate at the highest level with other educated human beings. Mr. Foster is certainly correct -- teachers must become intellectual leaders in the community. It would then follow that a school of education should be a professional school which builds upon an undergraduate education. The undergraduate medical college, the undergraduate dental college, and the undergraduate law school have vanished, and the undergraduate school of education should also disappear. This generalization will probably be realized first for teachers of academic secondary school subjects, next for elementary school teachers, but may never be realized for teachers of such subjects as art, music, physical education, and vocational education.

In order to discuss pre-professional education let us first consider medical education. The pattern is something like this. The student is first advised to take a liberal arts program in a top-notch college so that he may take his place in the world as an educated individual. While there is some controversy concerning the area in which he should major, most of the medical students major in a scientific area such as biology, zoology, or chemistry. Following graduation from the liberal arts college the student is admitted to a medical school. The program in the medical school is based on the medical or basic sciences. It is in the medical school that the student for the first time gets into the hospital to see patients. He makes a number of trips to the various wards and observes the patients as they are treated by doctors who are, presumably, specialists in their fields. The doctor treats the patient and describes to the student the symptoms and the treatment. The student is also in a position to observe the "bedside manner" of the doctor. (It is interesting to note that the academic studies of the student are not in methods of practicing medicine, but are rather in the sciences basic to the study and practice of medicine.) The student then proceeds from observing patients to working in out-patient clinics where he is introduced to the problems of treating illnesses of varying types. His laboratory courses include work on cadavers and upon mock-ups of human beings. His "how to" work is strictly in the nature of actual practice in medical situation, rather than in listening to lectures on "how to." Following graduation from medical school, he proceeds to an internship in a hospital for which he has applied. (These internships are in a strange juxtaposition to the rest of materialistic American life in that the best internships pay nothing, whereas the very worst internships pay the highest salaries.) It is in the internship that the doctor starts the actual practice of medicine, although he is constantly under supervision. Supervision, of course, is greater at the beginning than at the end of his work. Following the internship, the medical doctor then initiates a practice or else returns to the medical school for study of a specialization.

Now let's follow this analogy and see what it would be like to do this in a school of education. First, of course, there should be a liberal education as good as is possible. While the content of the liberal arts is in itself the subject of a raging controversy, such controversy seems to be nit-picking, and one should be content with the definition of liberal arts education as the study of intellectual disciplines under the tutelage of fully qualified professors. Put in a different way, it means the study of history under historians, the study of physics under physicists, the study of chemistry under chemists, the study of literature, music, and art under those who study and perform in these areas.

Since professional education is not a discipline, but is rather a means of applying knowledge from many disciplines to problems encountered in changing behavior, the teacher and other types of educational practititioners should have a thorough understanding of the disciplines basic to professional education. These are commonly called the behavioral sciences, and include anthropology, sociology, social psychology, and psychology. The pre-ed undergraduate would also study philosophy, including the philosophy of science, in addition to the behavioral sciences listed. Since there are many old ideas prevalent regarding the content of the behavioral sciences (one liberal arts course in general psychology dealt only with the professor's approach to the concept of self-image), the pre-ed concentration should enable the future student to understand, among other things:

1. The degree to which human characteristics can be modified.
2. The tremendous diversity of human customs and ethical norms.
3. The relation of moral standards to the culture.
4. The applicability of the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle to human behavior. (For instance, educational tests not only measure human behavior, but tend to change the cultural and education norms which are sought.)
5. The application of the concept of feedback to educational problems. (One of its many uses is in programmed instruction.)
6. That all members of a group do not embrace equally the goals of the group.
7. That since each person in a situation perceives the world from his own personal behavior center, students may not see the world the way the teacher sees it.
8. That correlation is not necessary causation; from which the potential teacher should know, for instance, that differences related to social class and other environmental variables might well be changed.

These are but a few of the concepts which could be developed. Teachers should be so well grounded in behavioral science that in the future they would not be labeled as "behavior science illiterates," as they have rightly been termed by Kenneth Clark.

The actual professional components can be seen in the model of the two-year MAT Program of which there are three parts. The first is professional subject matter with methods taught in public school classrooms. Very briefly, the N.Y.U. Tri-University Project is now trying this idea in two public schools. Second, liberal arts subject matter concentration should be continued into the graduate school. Third, there should be a full year internship in at least two different school situations. And along with all of this, during the two years of the MAT Program, I would urge a far wider use of teaching methodology. For experts in the field of the methodology of teaching, as we all are, we seem to come up with a very small range of materials and ideas when we start to teach. One of the things that made me think of this is the fact that I just received a catalog from the University Council for Educational Administration. I think they demonstrate what can be done in the field of education in a relatively short time in improving the teaching of the subject; they now have a catalog of 20 or 25 pages of materials that can be used to teach educational administration. Films, tapes, simulation materials, in-baskets, cases, etc. I haven't seen anything like this in the teaching of methodology or in any of the undergraduate teacher education programs.

Schools of Education as Research and Development Centers

The major difference between schools of education, medicine, agriculture, and dentistry is that the latter are essentially large research institutions which use their new knowledge to change the way their practitioners behave in their professional roles. Schools of education are full of public school people and the trouble with education professors is that they are too much like the public school people in attitudes, opinions, and knowledge. They are practical educators who prefer a little bigger arena in which to play. The difference is the commitment to research that is found in colleges of agriculture and medicine which is totally lacking in schools of education. The success of colleges such as agriculture is based upon the fact that the solution to problems which they propose are much better than those generated by farmers. As a result, farmers have learned to look to their country agent, their farm bulletins and radio programs, and to the agricultural college for answers. Nothing of the sort exists in education. Public school people will listen to a professor's opinion because he's like them or because he's jolly and friendly. Don't expect them to do anything about it though. The sound, relevant, and profitable research that is published in agricultural bulletins is read and behavior is changed. Not many teachers and superintendents ever read anything, then change their behavior.

There are other differences, but they don't amount to much because the foundation for the whole operation is missing. Research in the professional school should be defined as the systematic search for solutions to significant problems. In other schools, for instance, research which resulted in the Salk vaccine was done in a medical school; the study of mouth cancer in the dental school; material which preserved ancient monuments that was invented by the New York University Institute of Fine Arts; and the Bail Bond Project at our law school. The latter got at the problem created by the fact that poor people can't raise bond when they're thrown in jail; there had to be some other way of their exercising their rights in society, so the Bail Bond Project was devised and has been very successful. In schools of education we have a lot of problems which we wring our hands about, and for which we should attempt to find solutions, so that teachers and administrators can do a better job. For instance, we need to be able to reverse the decrement curve. We know that in the ghetto schools a child starts off at about grade norm or a little below, but by the time he's in eighth grade he's at least four to five grades below the national norm. This is one of the major kinds of problems which we have virtually no information about solving at the present time. I noticed our speaker this morning kept referring to problems and commenting quickly, "But we don't know much about it;" I would agree with him on this matter. There is need for a new set of roles in education in terms of the research and development center concept, and I would advocate at this point, for example, the creation of the role of the "developer." By this I mean the person within an educational situation who can see a problem, advise on the research needed (but not do it himself), and then take the solution to the field to put it into operation. The U.S. Office of Education sponsored R and D Centers we now have in this country are not Research and Development Centers; they're research and dissemination centers. They do some research and then publish that research. No other profession attempts to change behavior merely by publishing research studies. We need systems of converting research findings into useable units. For example, suppose you have a headache; you take an aspirin tablet. The aspirin table is the end result of a long research process, but nobody really cares; all one knows is that when one has a headache one takes two aspirin and pretty soon the headache is gone (unless one is unfortunate enough to have a brain tumor). Now I would venture that if educators were trying to cure headaches they would give people a copy of the doctoral thesis on the research on headaches and tell them to make their own medicine; this is, in essence, what we're doing to public school teachers with our research.

New Relations with Schools and Communities

The third point is new relations with schools and communities. I would say that a new type of relationship must be built between university schools of education and the public school based on the fact that schools of education have something to offer substantively. Too many university projects in ghetto schools -- and I can name them -- are based on the arrogant concept that university people care more for ghetto children than the public school teachers do, and have, therefore, contributed to the chasms developing between the establishment teachers and the ghetto communities. The ghetto communities feel outraged because the projects have not, with very few exceptions, resulted in any better education. The relations with schools, then, must be based upon the fact that the university schools have something to offer. When universities and the university schools of education work with communities, they should either come in with a known and proven solution to a specific problem or they should study the problem in and with the local school with a degree of competence and sophistication that the school could not muster by itself. That is the crucial point. If the public school could do the study just as well by itself, the school of education ought to stay out. Few university-based projects have gone into the ghetto with this basic understanding. One that has, and has made a real contribution is the New York University Institute for Developmental Studies.

Now, the question of the relationship of the school of education to the communities. I really don't know what this role should be. The question was raised this morning in a very interesting way; Mr. Olson, I believe, talked about the need for having the community help to define the role of the teacher. I'll say this, I don't think that I want to ask Mr. Foster's community, as he described it this morning, to define the kind of teachers that our university is to train. I don't think that the next generation of teachers should be defined by the John Birch society, by perverts who threaten death in the night, or by refugees from a psychiatrist's couch. That's not my idea of community involvement. But, of course, I don't think that all communities are like that. I've had five years in the public schools, six years on a board of education, twenty years of work with rural and suburban communities such as Earlville and Scarsdale, and have worked with ghetto groups from Harlem to Bedford Stuyvesant. I don't think that in any of these places one can find a predominance of people of the kind described in this morning's speech. My narrow view leads me to be a little more optimistic, but if Mr. Foster's picture is really what the world is like, I don't want to have those people define what teachers should be. I think that most of the community groups active today are more interested in power than they are in better teaching; when they get more interested in education than power, then I think they will have something to say and there are many that will have much to say that is constructive. I think that the teacher's role in the future must be forged in a crucible which contains the community (the whole community) the teachers' associations and the unions (and I think that these two should never be overlooked for one minute), and the country as a whole; that is, there should be a national view of the role of the teacher, the university and the students, focused on the university since it will be held responsible.

New Roles and Sources of Professors

New roles are emerging in schools of education. Educational advancement and adaptation to new needs require speedy incorporation of applicable knowledge and techniques into the content and organization of curricula, into methods and materials of instruction, and into the organization and administration of the whole educational enterprise. It should be pointed out that new knowledge does not automatically become available for education upon discovery, but must first filter through the frequently neglected processes of codification, interpretation, and dissemination. We need professor who will perform these tasks.

We have not had in the past people in schools of education who have taken as a primary job the conversion of new knowledge into something that can be used in the classroom, other than textbooks. Of course, all professors of education in their public speeches will tell you how dreadful it is to have textbook-oriented education. What I'm advocating, then, is the introduction into schools of education, of people who would be called "codifiers of knowledge." At present, we have a very limited notion of what a professor of education is, but we also have the idea, even in the more advanced schools, that they all have to be alike. I advocate the concept that the faculty of the school of education should be comprised of a number of different kinds of people fulfilling a number of specified roles, that these people should function together, and that there should be no need for all these people to do the same thing. We are making some strides in this direction at New York University since our evaluation system is based on the fact that each professor formally chooses his own role, then, first in a process of self-evaluation and second with his chairman at the end of the year, estimates the degree to which he has accomplished his own role as he described it. In the past we have also had a very narrow range of people to choose from to become professors. In the few studies that I have seen of the professors of school administration, and the professors of other kinds of adjectival function (such as educational psychologists and educational sociologists) virtually all come directly from the public schools. Since education -- at least in my definition -- is the application of knowledge from various disciplines to problems in the institution of education, we need to have people from these disciplines on the faculties of schools of education and we at N.Y.U. have made some efforts in this direction. We now have people who are sociologists, economists, and psychologists in departments like administration.

Now, one other kind of role (a role for a school of education) has been suggest by Professor S. M. Miller, who had been doing work in new careers and in the development of social policy for the poor. He indicates -- I think that he is absolutely right -- that one of the roles of the school of education should be that of critic and advocate of social policy; and I would put particular emphasis on the concept of the school of education as a critic. Any professional school must have the autonomy and the courage to stand aside and to criticize its institution and its practitioners. In other words the medical school should be able to criticize doctors; the law school, lawyers; and the school of education, the public school systems and the teachers. Too many schools of education and professors have been individually co-opted; it's the price paid for being too close to the schools and too involved in their day-to-day operation. For instance, as in our case, the School of Education, which depends so heavily on the union to supervise its practice teachers, finds it difficult in a strike to speak its mind on the issues. Or the professor who receives sizeable consultant fees from Superintendent X, finds it difficult to stand up and be counted when the superintendent is not doing the job. These difficulties can be overcome, but the fact is that at the present time, we as schools of education are not as detached from the public school as folklore suggests; indeed, we are so inextricably intertwined with it that we cannot perform our function as a professional school, which is that of critic and advocate of new policies for our own profession. In other words, the school of education must become the loyal opposition to the public school establishment; but at the present time we're not. We must be able to criticize foolishness when it appears, as it does so often.

What I've been trying to say is that professional educators are in a sense emerging from a long period of cultural deprivation, and we must upgrade ourselves from our present state -- the ostentatious normal school -- and become truly professional schools in the same tradition as agriculture, medicine, and the law.

Remarks
Representative Ernest Morial and Dean Daniel Griffiths

The following exchange concerning Dean Griffiths' speech did not follow immediately after Griffiths' speech but came during a sequence of remarks by community representatives having to do with the proceedings of the first day of the conference. Representative Morial's remarks are placed first in this series because they bear most closely on Dean Griffiths'. Representative Morial is the first Negro to serve in the Legislature of Louisiana; he is one of the country's most distinguished Civil Rights lawyers. He was involved in some of the earliest suits having to do with racial equality and the schools (cf. his remarks in the small group discussion). Mr. Morial's brother is the principal of a school in the black ghetto in New Orleans; and Representative Morial, as a legislator in Louisiana, is concerned fairly intimately with working on matters of policy and support for the state's institutions of Higher Education, including those which have a primary concern with the education of teachers. As a lawyer and as a legislator, Mr. Morial has been intimately concerned with the exercise of power in the formulation of school policy and policy for the education of teachers. Representative Morial's position is, I think, clear.

Representative Ernest Morial
Louisiana State Legislature

Mr. Chairman, I would like to first express my deep appreciation for having been invited here to participate in the Tri-University Project. I, as a lawyer, am familiar with some of the legal reforms that have taken place in America, particularly the reforms which are a consequence of the civil rights movement, and presently of the War on Poverty as it relates to the neighborhood legal centers. I would simply like to ask Dean Griffiths two questions. But first I would like to restate what he said so that I might be accurate as to what his remarks were. Dean Griffiths, I think you made the comment that you did not think that community interests should influence teacher training. Is that correct?

Dean Griffiths: Ask your question and I'll answer it.

Ernest Morial: How can schools of education be responsive to the needs of society, and how can educators be engineers and architects of educational reform if the schools of education are not influenced by certain community interests as they relate to the curriculum in schools of education?

Dean Griffiths: I really did stop beating my wife before I left home. I don't really understand the point of view here.

What I'm talking about is that you simply cannot make a teacher education program, just like you cannot make a program for training lawyers or doctors or anybody else, by just indiscriminately getting 'community reaction,' and that's the fact of the matter. I was very interested in the comments of Mr. Dick in which he indicated that they were attempting some programs which I believe he said "would be accepted by the community."[1] Even in this situation, they are not just taking everything 'the community,' whatever that is, says and sticking it wholesale into the program. There have to be decisions made, there have to be priorities set, and my comment this morning was that I will not stand by and have a teacher education program dictated by what I personally believe to be the worst elements of the community; and I'll list them: I don't want a teacher education program that's dictated by the John Birch Society; I don't want a teacher education program that is dictated by the kind of people who call up school board members and superintendents in the middle of the night and say they're going to lynch them. Now if I'm not clear on this point, I'll talk for a long time on it. I don't really see where there's much of an issue here.

---

[1] Mr. John Dick of the school board of the Rough Rock Demonstration School -- a Navajo Community School at Chinle, Arizona -- had spoken before Representative Morial. His remarks are placed after Mr. Morial's small group session remarks in this volume.

I do think that the teacher education programs, just like all other kind of programs, should be responsive to certain of the groups in the community, but not every group. Every group is not as good as or as reliable as or as legitimate a group every other group. Now, if we need to spell this out in more detail, I'm perfectly willing to do it. I've not said at any point along here that I'm not working with black groups or with groups of any color, with any religion or race or anything else. I'm talking about groups that are clearly outside the purview of what I would feel to be (and what I think most Americans would feel to be) the kind of society that we'd like to have. Now if you want a society that's like the John Birch Society, you ought to inculcate a concept of citizenship in students which suggests that it's perfectly all right to give anonymous threats over the telephone, to lynch people, to do things of this sort.

Ernest Morial: I simply wanted you to elaborate on that because civil rights lawyers, particularly, know that when we started out in the effort to desegregate schools in the south and attack _de facto_ school segregation, the views which we were setting forth in our court cases too, were not the most popular views among the citizens. And I'm sure that some of the things that some of the elements in our society now advocate are not the most popular things.

You mentioned the bail reform. We know as lawyers that this approach was not the most popular thing, that there were certain elements and strong forces in society which resisted release on recognizance and bail reform. We know that there are elements in the community who are opposed to correlating poverty problems with education. I didn't have reference to such elements as the Birch Society or the people who buy sheets with holes in them and people of that nature. But I wanted to make it clear, and I thought you did, that there are certain things to which a school of education should be responsive as it relates to community interest in the training of people who have a responsibility to bring about social change through educational reform in our society. If the schools of education fail to do this, no one else will.

And of course the teachers can't do it on their own if they haven't received a type of training in the Schools of Education which is different from the traditional type of training which has existed in schools of education throughout this nation. Law schools, since you mentioned the other professional schools, have been responsive to the dictates of the community. Law schools throughout this nation have put in programs on 'law and poverty.' Have Schools of Education put in programs specifically designed to train people _for the problems of the ghetto_ programs dealing with poverty children who go to ghetto schools? If so to what extent? Maybe N.Y.U. has, or a few other schools have. But to what extent has this view permeated professional training of teachers throughout this nation? The leadership has to be someplace, and fortunately your institution is leading. Some others perhaps are not. And I would think that this project is one example of that type of leadership.

But I have a second question. I think you also mentioned that the leaders in the movement for community control of education now are more concerned with power than with education. How can these persons who want to bring about educational reform in our American system do it if they are unable to develop the type of power and the type of 'clout' that's necessary to change boards of education and to change the attitudes of superintendents and make them responsive to needs of people such as Mr. Dick, to the needs of people in Appalachia, to the needs of the ghetto boy and girl who live in the slums of America; in the urban centers and pockets of poverty in this nation? How can we do the reforming if it isn't coupled with a power concept? And we know -- and let us not fool ourselves -- that everything in this nation depends upon who exercises the power and who exercises the influence to make changes in the establishment; that's what this 'game' is all about. And this is why I say to you, and I would like you to answer that question, how can we separate the two: educational reform from a concern with developing power to bring about educational reform in America?

Dean Griffiths: The point that you are making, and it's certainly no question at all, is obviously true for the American system, the way it was set up, the way it operates: in order to bring about change a group has to have power. There's no question about it. That's what the word 'power' means. The word 'power' is defined as the ability to get somebody to do what you want him to do and what he doesn't want to do. That's all that power is. Now, I'm not opposed to groups attempting to get power. And I've been a leading advocate and a leading person myself in a number of power drives. I kind of like the game. It's a lot of fun. And it's not only a lot of fun, it's the only thing that pays off; I'll grant you that.

There are really two answers to your question, and I think I should answer in the constructive way first. There have been many groups in this country which have achieved the purposes that the Navajos are attempting now through their schools as described today. They have done it without resort to the power ploy. I'll name a few of these and then indicate how it was done. I don't think it's possible for the present group, the blacks, the Indians, a number of other groups, to do it this way, but it has been done a number of ways.

What I am getting at here is the so-called 'melting pot' concept which has been the basic ideology of the public schools for an awfully long time. The melting pot concept is what public school people always talked about but what the people in the country in various ways sabotaged. If you take a look at New York City you'll find that there's really been almost no 'melting' ever done in New York City. For instance, we have communities of Hasidic Jews, Yorktown which is German, Chinatown, Italian segments, and so forth. Now most of these groups, particularly the Jews and the Chinese, ran their own school systems separate from the public schools: e.g., the Jewish day schools. The Chinese at the present time have a remarkable school system in Chinatown. They start at five o'clock in the evening and go to seven, five days a week. They teach Chinese culture and writing to the children. They do it in addition to the public schools; they do it because they can afford to and because there are enough of them right there. There are twelve hundred children in the school; they are able to concentrate a large number of students in this one school, and they can afford to support that school. So this is one way in which you get the so-called educational reform; it is possible, and a number of cultures have done this. They have simply run a school system parallel to the American public school.

Now a number of people did 'melt.' I just want to say this. For instance, my father-in-law starved for the first ten years of his life in the peat-bogs outside of Belfast, Ireland. Then he and his family got on a boat and came over here, and you couldn't any more teach him Irish culture than you could pull his teeth out without gassing him. He wasn't interested; he wanted no part of it; he had 'melted.'

Now an awful lot of the people at the present time don't want to 'melt.' They are powerless, they're poor and in many cases there aren't a great many of them. So I think for these groups the only thing they can do is to change the public school system. They've got to get the public school system in their communities to drop the 'melting pot' concept and to introduce the multicultural concept as the ideology of American public school. The only way you can do that is to get on school boards yourself, get lots of votes, and where you haven't got a chance to get on the board, to demonstrate and to do the kinds of things which, in American culture, result in political change. So I think that there isn't any other way to do it, and I just wanted to make a somewhat larger explanation of it. If you've got the ingredients, there's another way. If you haven't, then you just simply have to build your own power bloc. And virtually every group that's gotten anywhere in this country has done the same thing.

Group Discussion

Representative Ernest Morial

The following group discussion began after Mr. Chambers' speech and continued, like the discussion with Mr. Chambers, during the period of the conference in which plenary session speeches were not being made. Most of the members of the group discussing education and power with Mr. Morial were people from Higher Education and from elementary schools in the South. I have mentioned the extent to which Mr. Chambers and Mr. Foster were "blocked" in various ways in endeavoring to realize what they had in mind -- perhaps not permanently but certainly temporarily. Mr. Morial has been a leader in handling school desegregation cases in the South; the degree to which his efforts (and those of all men like him who have sought justice in education in the South and the North) have not borne fruit may be suggested by the fact that since the Supreme Court, Brown vs. Board of Education desegregation decision in 1954, no desegregation has taken place:

> There seems to be almost no hope that southern schools will ever really desegregate, according to the Southern Regional Council, a private biracial research agency financed by foundation grants. Although the Council was guardedly optimistic in 1965 and 1966 after passage of the 1965 Civil Rights Act, it now says: "There is virtually no reason to find optimistic words, to say things may improve. The mistakes of the past are repeated. The nation has not seemed aware even of the failure, let alone resolute enough to end it." One primary fact behind Council discouragement is that the number of Negro children in segregated schools is higher now than ever before. All of the laws and court decrees necessary for desegregation have been made, but "what remains wanting is the commitment to implement them." One of the major blocks to desegregation is a provision in Title IV of the Civil Rights Act which says in effect that states cannot be forced to bus students across towns to achieve racial balance. Many cities do this voluntarily, but those who don't cannot be forced to do so. The only instrument available to federal agencies is the withholding of federal funds.[1]

---

[1] Council-Grams, National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Illinois, Vol. XL, No. 6, p. 1.

One is reminded of Davin's discussion with Stephen Daedalus, in A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, a discussion of what a country and history are and what they may be to a young man:

> Stephen : "The soul is born," he said vaguely, "first in those moments I told you of. It has a slow and dark birth, more mysterious than the birth of the body. When the soul of a man is born in this country, there are nets flung at it to hold it back from flight. . ."
>
> Davin knocked the ashes from his pipe.
> -- "too deep for me, Stevie," he said. "But a man's country comes first. Ireland first, Stevie. . ."
>
> -- Do you know what Ireland is?" asked Stephen with cold violence. "Ireland is the old sow that eats her farrow. . ."

Ireland is not entirely an island.

GROUP DISCUSSION

Resource Person:
Representative Ernest Morial
Louisiana State Legislature
Chairman: Mr. Earl Rand

Mr. Ernest Morial: We Southern Negroes feel that perhaps the North is now beginning to realize that the problems of the South are not peculiarly ours, but are problems of the North as well as the South. And, of course, the big problem, as I view it, relates to an awareness on the part of the white community to recognize people as humans. The big movement in America to black power and black pride is simply an attempt by Negroes to say that they aren't anti-white, they are simply pro-Negro, and to try to develop an awareness and a concern about Negro institutions and improve the plight of Negroes in their communities through self-help and self-development. This has been brought into sharp focus as a result of school desegregation in the South and the black power movement, because now we're seeing that Negroes, more than ever before, are concerned with the schools and public education.

I'm a lawyer by profession, and my office has handled approximately ninety per cent of the desegregation school cases in the state of Louisiana. The suit to desegregate all these parish schools was filed before Brown versus the Board of Education. We simply held back on the case because the NAACP requested that we do. But I've seen in New Orleans and in the South that since the desegregation of the public schools, Negroes have become more concerned and more aware of the plight of the schools and the content of the curriculum and have attempted to relate these problems back to the community.

This has been further emphasized as a result of the black power movement and what some people refer to as "black militancy." Many people define militancy as violence and riots, but that certainly isn't militancy. I'm as militant, and I guess most of us sitting here, are as militant as anyone else; and I'm sure the gentlemen from Mississippi, Mr. White and Mr. Rogers, are as militant as anyone else in Jackson, Mississippi. But it's a different type of militancy, and I don't think Mr. Chambers is as militant as he pronounces himself to be from the standpoint of resorting to violence. I think his was a provocative oration.

We can't separate education from the problems that exist in America today. We just can't put education in a vacuum. As I view it, it's the composite of problems existing in the urban centers of America which will determine what course the educational programs of our cities take. The problems of poverty, ghetto and slum housing, discrimination and racism in the urban centers of America, North as well as South, present a challenge to educators; and educators cannot confine themselves to a closed room and not move out into the community to explore with people, as Mr. Foster pointed out, and establish a dialogue as it relates to the solution of the complex problems facing American cities today.

Participant: I've recently moved into the New York area, and the first thing we were hit with was the strike and the whole question of decentralization in the New York City school system. Now my first reaction as a teacher was, "Golly, we've got a union finally, we've got away from Miss Magillicutty who was never real pleased to join the union. I surely don't want to see that union go down."

And then I began to look around. Chambers made a point when he said, "You better show me by deeds." And I looked around to see who were the friends of the teachers' union right now, and I saw that some of these friends who were the biggest racists and who, just a short while ago, would have torn that union to ribbons, have now become the friends and champions of the union. I have three children in the New York City public school systems as of this September, and I began to wonder, "Now how do I stand? I'm a parent and I'm a teacher." In the community, the parents would begin to talk to me; and as they began to talk to me, they said things like, "Now you know why we don't want them telling us who's going to teach in the schools." And suddenly it hit me that what they were really saying is that it's all right for a white community to sit and tell the board, "No, we don't want this school. No, we're not going to vote for this new addition. And no, we don't want five new teachers. You're going to have to cut the budget Mr. Superintendent." But when it's the same black parent who cannot express himself as eloquently or perhaps doesn't have the same value standards as this white individual sitting there, then it shakes us up. We're frightened that maybe these people are going to tell us, who are white middle class, what they want, and this is frightening. And I think that, as Chambers said, I began to have sympathy for those poor white teachers who are so frightened that they're going to have to get into the black community and listen to the black community about what they want.

It was a terrible struggle for me, because I could hear myself saying, "Now, how do I prove to them that I'm a good guy? I'm going to have to go for a job and go to the district office and apply there. How are they going to know that I'm different from somebody else?" And then another friend said, "Well, all you have to do is sit down and talk to them and they're going to know pretty soon how you feel and what you think." And again I knew that inside I was saying, "I can't communicate with them." So these are the struggles that I find. I think I'm aware, and yet all of it came out during this recent crisis in the New York City schools and I said, "For the first time in my life, I don't approve of what the teachers' union is doing," realizing that it's trying to break the back of the black communities controlling their own schools.

Participant: In his talk, Dick Foster asked, "Can you really operate in an open society?" Are we willing to operate in an open society despite all the risks and the sensitivities on both sides? "Sensitivity of communication" is something that maybe has been played around too much, but it's a very serious time to start thinking of what we mean by "sensitivity." And I think Mr. Foster showed that he was really concerned and he has worked through this by deeds as well as by words. Although it's hard, we have to start somewhere and we have to start with both words and deeds. And we have to realize there's a certain super-sensitivity now on the black man's side that may not have been visible to the white man; because of this, it's a little shock now for a lot of white people to hear all of this.

Chairman: Isn't it true that much of the racist attitude is born in the home? Isn't much of the attitude that the child takes with him to school or wherever he goes born out of his home background and home experiences? I'm recalling some of the things that Dick Foster talked about; these parents who were concerned not about this issue that we are talking about, but about other things. The situation seems to be born in the home. How much value can we, or Chambers, place on a father and a mother who say, "I'm with you," and then as soon as a white community begins to disintegrate, (in other words, a black person moves in) they move out into a totally different community and join an organization which says, "Keep the blacks out." Is this a part of the complex?

Participant: One thing the black man is saying is, "Whites, you're hypocritical as hell in that you do not show a genuine respect for human variability in the black community to the same degree that you recognize it and respect it in your own."

Participant: I think you're asking for something that hasn't been done in any community. I don't think the whites have accepted the variability in the white community. We need to change our educational approach so that we encourage attitudes which will recognize and respect individuality. But we haven't achieved this in any group. I don't see this being done with black youngsters or with Indian youngsters, or any other kind of youngsters because we just haven't done this with white ones.

Participant: Do we have to do it first with white youngsters?

Participant: No. We just need to learn to do it.

Chairman: I want to ask Mr. Morial to say something about his first sessions in the legislature in a relatively closed society.

Mr. Morial: They were real educational. Most of you now, I'm sure, know what the situation is in Louisiana. But this touches and borders on much of what we're talking about today and much of what is happening in the black communities is that we are having to develop an ability to exercise some clout, not necessarily with a stick or with a match or gasoline, but clout, political clout. And because in certain sections of the state of Louisiana, as well as in Mississippi, Negroes have been able to develop this, the reception is different. The climate is changing; perhaps not as rapidly as we would like it to change, but it is changing, and because of that, my presence in the legislature was uneventful, from a racial standpoint.

Part of the reason that this climate of opinion is so slow to change is due to teachers: the failure on the part of educators to identify with community problems and the failure of individual teachers to participate in community activities outside of the school. I want to touch upon what I have experienced as a parent, as well as someone who has been involved in school problems as a lawyer.

In Orleans parish, I was president of the NAACP branch for a number of years during the time of the school crisis, when the legislature went crazy and passed all of the legislation that stopped the integration of the schools. We had the most difficult time generating interest among Negro teachers to make them see that what we were trying to do was in their best interest and in the best interest of black kids in the community. The school board continued to have these compulsory meetings which were segregated, and instructional meetings for teachers; even after school desegregation, they continued to assign Negro teachers to all-Negro schools. We had to work with those teachers sub rosa to emphasize to them that they should become a part of what we were trying to do.

I think the same thing is true of white teachers. One of the greatest things that can happen to you as teachers is for you to move out of the realm of these teacher associations which pride themselves on being "professional" and get to the unions which you will control; you can make the unions whatever you want. The unions are trying to relieve teachers of some of the extra duties and the abundance of requirements that teachers have, which detract from their ability to be good teachers and to concentrate on their primary function -- to educate young people; they are trying to relieve them so that they can participate in community activities, and can make boards of education responsive to the community and to the needs of the teachers. I think the teachers' unions are doing this.

In the legislature in Louisiana this session, we had one problem because the attorney for the Orleans Parish school board took the position that Louisiana law did not permit the Orleans Parish school board to have a collective bargaining election to select a bargaining unit for the teachers. So therefore, we had a bill in the Louisiana legislature to provide for this. Of course, those who opposed it most were the heads of the teacher associations, not the teachers themselves, but the representatives of the teacher associations, because they thought it would have eroded their power if teachers were given the right to select a bargaining agent. Though the teacher associations would have been placed on a ballot equally with the unions, they were of the opinion that they could not be successful in that sort of an election. So the strongest opposition to this legislation came from the teacher associations. The bill was voted out of committee but it lost on the floor of the house. It appears to me that the wisest thing to have done would have been to permit the unions to have collective bargaining elections in the schools without having had to make this an issue before the Louisiana Legislature to establish something which many of us, as lawyers, feel teachers have the right to do without any legislation. We disagree with attorneys for the school boards around the state that Louisiana law does not permit unions or teacher associations to conduct collective bargaining elections. But I had one man say to me that because I was supporting labor unions or collective bargaining for teachers, I had sold out all the black teachers in the state of Louisiana, and he was going to do everything he could to make this known throughout the state. So I simply said to him if he wanted to take on that challenge he could, because I know who would win in that type of battle.

This exhibits to me the attitude that is present in the minds of teachers. Many of them think that they are so professional that they shouldn't be affiliated with unions, even teacher unions which will be controlled by teachers.

Participant: This relates to the way in which our history books treated union organizations and unions and the development of unionism.

Participant: In the black area of Seattle, fifty black people went into a store and said, "Close your store by Monday or it won't be left standing." Now, my point is, that although I accept that history has tried to present a dehumanized picture of black people, and although I accept that we've been wrong in the past, and this store overcharged and so on, how far do we go in making restitution?

Chairman: I think this is a part of the question that I was trying to raise before when I asked, "When are you real?" What had this store done? Has it continued to perform and operate in the traditional system?

We put the O.E.O. back into the hands of Mayor Daley and the other mayors and the cities and they got their power back. And in Houston, I've had a chance to see what it has done to the Office of Economic Opportunity program. Instead of moving forward to open up -- and isn't this part of what Chambers was saying -- you're not real when you do this because there's just a certain distance that you are supposed to go. You're not supposed to go all of the way. I'm going to say this, then I'll hush because I'm chairman. You might have to be black to know what Chambers is talking about -- black and from the South. But Chambers left the gate open to come and talk with us as human beings didn't he? Come and talk with us and we can help you to try to understand what it means to have grown up in a society where when you got on the bus it was, "Go to the back," without any question. You couldn't get on a plane. For a long time, you couldn't even buy a plane ticket in the early days.

Participant: But many of us can't have those experiences.

Chairman: Well, this is why it's difficult. This is why you have to wrestle with the problem. You couldn't eat. I've rode several times, from Gladewater, Texas to Atlanta, Georgia, all night, all the next day until night without a meal.

Participant: I understand, but I say I can't experience that.

Chairman: This is why you have to be patient with me.

Mr. Morial: That's why you have to make restitution for the sins of your forefathers.

Participant: I guess I just want to take a different outlook. We are adults and we are pretty well set in our ways, but I think the children will make it. We have integration now. Since we are teachers, let's get in the classroom and let's let children be children, and when they go in a home economics room, stop putting colored children over in one part of the room, making them conscious of their color and their 'inferiority' and the like.

I had the experience last year, my little girl was fourteen and almost fifteen. The students have freedom of choice of schools down in Louisiana. So she chose; she was not pushing anything, going through her school. And we had not talked in the home, (this might not be true of all Negro homes,) we have not talked in the home about how we hate white people. We have talked about some good white people. And when she went to school, I found this happening after a couple of months: she came home and she started looking through Time and Life, Ebony, at all these racial issues.

She got more race conscious after she went to the demonstration school. Now it was something that happened at school that made her aware of that which she was not aware of in the home, she was not aware of in the community. And I know in some instances that there are separate places for colored children -- "You do your cooking over in this room." Let's see them as children, assign them all this. If we have a group working on something, don't try to push this little child in this group. Let them make their own way through the situation. I think the children will get it. I don't think we'll get it. It's good to know history but I don't want to go back where Ernest Chambers went in his talk; it does something to me because I know all of those things. I don't like to stir up those things. I want to look forward to a new day.

Chairman: But you've got to do something to those people into whose homes those children go back every evening. They are adult and they have got to help in this situation some way.

Participant: What are we as educators really doing about this sort of thing? What kind of honest dialogues are we having on this issue, in the Tri-U project and in colleges of education generally. What kind of experiences are we giving potential teachers? Are we getting them into urban centers?

There seems to be an undertone of fear, in those of us who are white at least, and perhaps in those of us who are not. How do we get at building the kind of strength of character, the personality that it takes, to establish the teacher who can work effectively in a situation. We're all afraid we're not going to come through as "good guys." How do we do it? Part of it is through this kind of a dialogue.

Participant: I think another part is through putting some Negroes on school boards and the like. Let them have a voice too.

Chairman: Well, isn't it also necessary to define the basis of fear? What really are we afraid of? I'm not just talking about teachers because I don't believe the fear is just in teachers.

Mr. Morial: I think the fear is something historical and it filters down to a mass of people. The fear is in the establishment, the white power establishment, and that's what the black brothers are trying to break down; they are trying to break down the power establishment, the downtown establishment and the urban centers of America, who control the destiny of black folks (and of white people, too).

Participant: Grocery store owners who sell shoddy goods in black ghettos and charge high prices ought to be closed down. They ought to be burned down if they are exploiting people, whether they're black or white, with shoddy inferior goods and charging them high prices and high mark-ups on the commodities that are being sold to them. They should be burned down.

Participant: But this is what we cannot accept. Regardless of what persons have done, burning down is not the answer.

Mr. Morial: I don't think it's the answer. But I think that Negroes and poor folks, white poor as well, have to move from a position of strength. You can't get a man to do anything if you're afraid of him. You have to deal with him from a position of strength. You have to negotiate from strength, from the ever abiding threat, that you're going to put him out of business whether it's by "burning him down" or whether it's by picketing his place to such an extent that his margin of profit is reduced so much that he can't operate.

The same thing has to be done with the school boards. Pressure has to be put on the school boards and on the teachers. Teachers are going to have to make their own effort by stepping and moving out into the communities and participating in the self-help programs that are being conducted now by Negroes -- street academies in New York, and other things of this sort -- and by going into the communities and saying, "We have special talent, we have special skill, and we are ready to work with you and co-operate with you and talk on a man to man basis with these people." The whole fundamental thing is dignity. It's dignity for a man to be treated as a man and as another man's equal. And this is what Chambers was talking about. And this is what he said to Dick Foster when Foster asked him that question. He said, "Treat me like a man and I'll treat you like one." And that's the way he summed it up, essentially.

Teachers are not leading this nation, neither college professors nor school teachers in the public schools of this nation. Have they been identified to a large extent with the problems confronting America today? And they are the ones who are cutting off dialogue with young people who want dialogue, who want to explore the problems. You have to move out of the confines of your classroom into the community to make education be more than simply the classroom disciplines that go on in a day to day basis, but move into the community and give assistance to all of the projects, the myriad of federal programs that exist and the O.E.O. Programs in the communities.

Concern yourself about the problems of welfare that affect that poor little black boy or white boy who comes to a school and his family is under welfare and he doesn't have any lunch, or he comes to school shoddy or poorly dressed; concern yourself about parents who don't want to send their children to white schools because their children can't dress as well as the white children in the schools; and concern yourself about some of these problems, about the inequities in the welfare system in America, about the election machinery in your communities, by encouraging voter participation and voter education to bring about the changes which are going to make teachers more secure and remove some of the unfounded fear that exists in the minds of white people.

You see, when black people do something, they're not only liberating black people but they're liberating white people too, because freedom is indivisible; and to the extent that white people withhold freedom and dignity from black people in America, they're withholding it from themselves. That's why you should get out into the ghetto and work and give these people a leadership because you yourselves are being victimized, and you should join with these people to eradicate the injustices that exist.

The white man who doesn't accomplish anything in America really has very little excuse for not doing so. The black man can give a million reasons why he hasn't been able to move out of the ghetto into the mainstream of America. A white boy really doesn't have that excuse. He can't rationally find any reason for not having accomplished anything in America.

Participant: I take exception to your last statement. All people are variable. So don't say that every white boy ought to have it made or he's worthless, because we whites are just as variable as you.

Participant: Everybody has problems. But at this particular point in history, a white person who says, "I have it too," is begging the question and evading the problem. This is a critical time in history when black people have to have the last word for a few minutes. In other words, I think the black people have got to be given by white, black, and Indian, a chance to say it and say it like it is because it hasn't been said like it is. The black have been talking to themselves. The white have been saying what they wanted to say. The blacks worked for the white and said what the white wanted him to say. But now the black is saying it out loud for the first time so everybody can get it, and fur is going to fly.

This is begging the question to say, "But I have it too." We know you have it too. We know that everybody in America, especially the economically lower class, who haven't the money, have problems. And it's going from a white-black to a rich-poor. We all know that. But at this point in history you've got to face it. The black man has got to have a chance to stand up and say it, and say it loud, long, and clear. Just like you teach these children to pronounce, so they'll learn correct English or whatever you call correct, later on when they get into ordinary conversation at least they say these things from habit. We've got to overexaggerate on the black, black, black until the black himself is recognizing that he's black.

Chairman: Our time has just about run out on us but I want to open another bag of chips. I asked you to talk about the nature of all these fears and then I don't believe we did talk about all of them. I'm wondering how much fear is related. I'm going to tell you about two happenings that I know of. One of them I read yesterday morning.

In Florida, I forget the name of the place, an eighteen year old Negro boy was beat to a pulp in June by some whites, vigilantes. First of all, news was submerged, wasn't let out. Secondly, this was pronounced to have happened because of a wreck, a collision on the highway. He was taken and thrown by the side of the highway. And then just this past week, a candidate for sheriff let out what really happened. It was assumed that he had some relationship with a white girl. And they took him out and beat him up and beat him to a pulp.

The second incident happened in the little home town where I used to work, not my home town but just where I worked for ten years. This spring, the salutatorian of the class in a mixed school that had been desegregated was a young Negro boy, a senior in high school. He was in the gymnasium and I think he was dressing after an activity and a senior white girl came by (you might have read this in "Jet" or some part of it because it was in there) and said, "Who are you taking to the prom?" and he merely said, "I was thinking about asking you." And her brothers took him and beat him to a pulp right there in the gymnasium and nothing happened.

Everywhere I turn, I see little footnotes to or excerpts from this kind of thing. Isn't this a part of the fear that this little black boy might go out there into the white community? I've never seen any great disturbance about a white boy and a black girl. In the University of Houston campus, you can walk down and see them together -- white boy and black girl, but not the reverse. This seems to be part of the fear.

-- FOUR AMERICAN COMMUNITIES

- A Navajo Community
- A Farm Workers' Community
- Appalachia
- Woodlawn; Chicago

-- HIGHER EDUCATION

-- TEACHERS - AND - SCHOOL

The Navajo Community

The remarks which follow were made by three members of the Navajo Community:[1] Mr. John Dick, Mrs. Alice Neundorf, and Mr. Robert Norris. All three persons have been or are connected with the Rough Rock, New Mexico, Navajo Community School, a school which has been characterized as perhaps the most complete realization which America has of what the community can mean to the development of a school (the school is described in the third report of the Tri-University Project, Children in a Promised Land, pp. 151-153). Mr. Dick is an elder of the Navajo tribe and a member of the school board of the Rough Rock Demonstration School; he spoke in Navajo and was translated by Mrs. Neundorf. Mrs. Neundorf spoke as a teacher at the Rough Rock School and a younger member of the Navajo group. Mr. Norris spoke as a teacher who had participated in Rough Rock in its early stage, and as a supervisor of teachers who is now seeking to take what he learned at Rough Rock to new places. Nothing which an editor could say could add to or detract from the remarks which Mr. Dick, Mrs. Neundorf, and Mr. Norris make. One recalls Ruth Benedict's citation of the Zuni elder who observed "Our cup is broken, it cannot be made whole again."

It is not only the Navajo or the Zuni cup which has been broken in the assault of white, technological America on American Indian cultures. We have lost too, as Alice Neundorf observes:

> What I have been thinking about a long, long time -- it is a terrible thing probably to say -- is, in my ignorance I chose the right profession perhaps because I like to work with people. And I think our whole nation as a mammoth thing has the wrong value on things, on some things. Like for instance, the value put on people that are smart and that can go into something and sit out in their ivory tower or something that we can all bow down to. I think the value should be put on people that have the talent to work with people, people that have the talent to roll up their sleeves and get themselves involved and get their feet wet and really change things down at what we call in our situation the "hogan level." And even I get myself involved in bowing down to all the doctors and all the nurses and all the lawyers and all the scientists. We need them. But I think we have created such great things, and yet we are losing ourselves, we are losing our soul. And I think it's because of our value structure. How do you change your values? I would rather respect someone that can make one person who has never known happiness in his life happy for one day.

---

[1] The remarks of Mr. Dick were made on Thursday P. M.; those of Mr. Norris and Mrs. Neundorf on Friday. The small group discussion extended across Thursday and Friday.

Mr. John Dick
Rough Rock Demonstration School, Arizona

I want to thank you for coming here and for allowing me to speak before you. I have come for many, many miles. And where I come from, the place and the people are very different from all of you. You live in a beautiful house. You live in a beautiful place. Ours is different; beautiful in a different way.

Our school is very new. It is a demonstration school and was set up for us Navajo people. The things that we are trying are still new, but we are very confident that some of the things are accepted and wanted by the community. This school was set up two years ago, and involvement of the community was very new at this time. The school was intended to be run completely by the community with the Navajo school board and the Navajo voice in the school. I will add here that the schools before this have never allowed any of the community to have a voice in the schools. This is very, very new; it is only two years. I appreciate the fact that the children are brought in, from the very smallest, and it is just like raising something green. And the involvement of the community and my involvement in this education is what I value very highly.

The government has taught our children for many years. And many years have passed in which our children have been taught by someone else in someone else's way. We finally decided that a person with many degrees behind him, or a person with high school education or more, does not always know what is best for our children. We ourselves are educated in a certain way: we learn from life, and we educate our children for the life we live on our reservation and for what life will be like in the future.

Although the government has put much money into their schools, the government schools, we have not been successful in them. We cannot seem to adjust to the kinds of things they put before us. And they put our children through these schools. Many of the children turn away from them, which means that the schools are not succeeding; neither the teachers nor the students are succeeding. And therefore, we are trying this new way of teaching our own children which means we are making policies for the teachers the best way we can think of, the best way we can reach our children. We find that the modern way of living, knowing the English language and knowing how to get around in the modern culture is upon us and we must somehow learn to accept some of the things that they are putting before us if we are to have our culture survive. But we are also not forgetting the old ways of doing things, some of the things that we cherish, some of the things that we think our children should learn, to be able to survive in the future.

In our school we are teaching two cultures. We are offering a choice between the modern way of life and the way of the Navajos in the years past and at the present time. We want to have the children make a choice from both sides. We're not saying, "You must stay on the reservation and be as Navajos always have been before." We are saying, "We have the choice. You can learn both ways and be strong in both ways." We're not saying, as in the past the government has said, that you can completely change into the way of the modern society.

I am not saying that the government schools have not done a job that should have been done; they were successful in some ways. But they have forgotten that we have a culture; that we have a language; that we have a religion; that we also have a life that has been successful in the past; that theirs is not the only way; that we want our children to be like us, not like someone else. We want them to be successful, and to be successful they must know what is going on around them outside the reservation. I know how hard it is when you do not understand English; everywhere you go, you must have someone tell you how to get around and how to behave. It is very hard, and I want my children to know both. I want them to be experienced in both. But first of all I want them to be proud of being a Navajo.

Every day we talk about ways to improve the school to meet the needs of the children. Children are our primary concern because they are our leaders tomorrow and they are parents of tomorrow; we want them to have a head start. We want them to realize their parents' role in the school. We want them to be as responsible as their parents who are taking part in the school. And we want them to be successful because we see that to survive in this world we must know a trade or we must know some sort of a job where we can earn a living. This seems to be the way out in the future. This is the reason why we want our children to realize, as small as they can be, that they have a responsibility in the future.

We also talk in our meetings about the two ways of treating illnesses. One way, used by the Public Health Service, is treating the physical needs of our children, the physical needs of our people. One way, our own way, is treating the psychological needs of the people. And we are talking right now about having the medicine-man-program in our schools and about having the community involved in this. We want to preserve some of these things so that we will in the future still treat our people for psychological reasons and also have the doctors treat our children in their physical needs. We realize the importance of preserving our religion. The religion is our life and to survive we must have religion. Religion makes everything right again. Therefore, we want to preserve it as much as we can. We know that change is here to stay, but we must preserve those things that have always been with us and the things that we have lived by.

The best thing that we can do for our children now is to record all the good things that we know of in religion and in the stories of the past and the Navajo history as we know it. We want to preserve this for our children, even if only in book form; we are also working on this; because it is very important that we preserve our culture as much as we can, we are getting people, learned people, writers, historians, and educators, to help us put our stories in writing and to help us preserve a lot of our culture. We are asking everyone to respect us as a group of people with a language, with a religion, and with a way of life that has been successful before and than can be preserved with the help of a lot of people.

I humbly speak to you as a human being, as a brother to you -- we say in Navajo "dear ones" -- and I want you to know that we do have a problem. We want to continue these kinds of schools on our reservation. The Rough Rock School is the only school of this kind on our reservation. There are many schools on the reservation which do not involve the voice of the community, the voice of the parents or the school boards, but we are persuading these other schools to do the same; it is not an easy thing to do. I humbly thank all of you. Many of you have years of school behind you, know so much more than I do and have come from so many miles all around. I want you to remember what I have said when you go home.

Mrs. Alice Neundorf

Rough Rock Demonstration School

Navajo Reservation, Arizona

Mrs. Alice Neundorf
Rough Rock Demonstration School
Navajo Reservation, Arizona

I don't know what to say now. I'm exhausted. I have been exhausted before I came here with many problems. I think things are going very well now and I don't want to sadden you much more so that you are discouraged. But some of us are discouraged to the extent that it seems maybe it's almost too late for some things. So therefore, I'm not going to go into some of the very, very sad things that have been happening in Indian education for many years.

I hear that ignorance is bliss, or innocence is bliss. I think sometimes it's true. When you don't know what has happened in the past you may be happy with what is done for you and you feel fortunate on some of the things. But it doesn't last long when you're curious, when you're wondering how come things are better somewhere else, and things were better before, and how come things weren't getting any better. And it becomes almost an interesting quest, and it becomes very discouraging sometimes.

I think the reason Bob[1] has asked me to speak to you is because we have heard from my elders and we have also heard from the people from outside the reservation. Who are the people that are involved right now on the reservation? We probably need to hear from people like myself and the children. What do we feel about what is happening around us, which we are supposed to be in the middle of? I will be talking mostly as a member of the younger generation of Navajos and also as a teacher of the even younger generation, the children today. The history of Indian affairs -- I want to be very brief but I don't know how to do this -- the history is a mammoth thing. And like I say, I'm not going to expose you to some of the things that are very saddening. But I want to plead. And I think to be able to make it understood why I want to plead with you, I need to point out two or three things.

There is too much misunderstanding about the Indians in America today. Even the Indians themselves do not know anything about their own history. Very little has been put in their textbooks. And at this college level there is practically nothing said in American history about the American Indians and the directions which their culture has taken or any of these things. There are very, very small portions given to this. And yet when you go into research on your own, asking questions and reading other books, you find that American history was based on the American Indians. I'm not going to go into this history, but what's happening today is even more tragic in some ways than what has happened in the past. We are clutching to the very end of what we've had, what we have lost. All we are pleading, all we are asking is whatever we have left today, give us equal chance. I know every Indian who cares anything at all about what he is or what his ancestors had in the past, would rather turn away, would rather, I would say, drop out in certain ways than deal with the past, because we are, in a sense, powerless.

---

[1] Robert Norris; Mrs. Neundorf had not originally planned to speak in the plenary session.

The colored people tell us, as Mr. Gibbs has said, we have a cause. We can fight for something. We still have something. It's true. But I have a feeling that he has a better chance, in a way, because he has something visible to fight. He can retaliate against something. But our problems are quite invisible. We are faced with indifference. We are faced with things like paternalism. Our hands are tied to something we don't know. There are laws. There are all kinds of things to tie us down which we do not understand.

Just take this as an example: we are told we have a reservation; you grow up believing that this is your land, this is your hogan; this is the way it is going to be always. When you go into looking at the law books, it says in so many words that this is government land, this is not Navajo land. And you try a little farther. How can we get this to be our very own? Wasn't it ours in the beginning? Why is it written so that it is not ours in a legal sense? And then there comes up, if you try to have this land to yourself, it will be given over to the state and the state has a hold of this land. The Navajos have sixteen million acres or so, described as a federal land reservation for the Navajos to live on. That land would be turned over to the state, if it's going to be ours. It'll be in the states of Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado. This will be divided such. Then we will be paying taxes on much of it which is very arid and useless land. Beautiful, but that's about it.

Then you get frightened. What do I do? I am being held down. I'm being sat on by someone I cannot do without. And it is a problem which makes you very helpless. You cannot turn to your elders with a problem so mammoth because they do not even know what the problem is; and being so young, this kind of problem breaks us up. This seems like the only problem, but there are many. And I don't know what to ask of you, because, like I said, perhaps our enemy is not visible. We don't know where it is. And other Indians can fight something, perhaps. They have lost everything; some Indians have lost literally everything. They are very upset. The people that are upset are the ones that have graduated from colleges, that have discovered that they could research into their past.

Not too long ago, about a month ago, a very well known person died. I do not know what he really died of, but I think he died of a broken heart. His name was Warrior, and he was one of the people who has been very upset over the kinds of things that our people have gone through and are continuing to go through. It is a psychological thing. We are not fighting physical discrimination. It is the indiffer- to our culture, indifference to many of the things that we have believed. In essence, we are our own enemies because of what we are, what we believe, and all these things of our past. And I think we can begin to save some of these things and begin to bring them back if we could put a little more responsibility on the Indian parents and on the Indian community to help their own children instead of turning them over completely to the government, which has happened for the last perhaps forty years.

When finally the Treaty of 1868 had been really put into effect, it said Navajos would be given one teacher to every thirty children, which never happens in the stage we are in; but at least we have gotten the schools on the reservation, about forty years ago. Since then our schools are not really our schools. Let's put it this way: we have been "taken" in to be educated, and we have been, in a sense, brainwashed that this -- the way of your education -- is the only way out. My father used to tell me it was the only way out. And I have gone as far as I could. And I came back and I realized that it wasn't really all that good in some senses. I admire my teachers; I had wonderful teachers in many cases. But what a painful process it is to be pulled out of your home at the age of six and be put in a boarding school and be put under all kinds of different people, and not understand a word of what they're saying. And this is continuing right today.

In our school (the Rough Rock demonstration school) we have been given a chance, a chance which no one was really confident would work, but the reactions on the part of the Navajos were very favorable. And the first year we were very frightful because we were afraid the Navajos would not realize their opportunity. They were afraid, like all Indians are. They were very distrustful and very wary of the new program, because we have programs coming out of our ears. And usually these programs are to benefit somebody else, to get somebody else a job. And it turned out that this kind of school put responsibility on people without putting too much money into other people; the money was going to the parents who do not speak English, and they were being asked to tell stories to their own children. Some of them thought that to be paid like this was interesting. They have done it on their own for many years in their own homes but the people that were teaching have always looked down upon some of these things and have never incorporated them into their schools.

We have some interesting programs and I would like to invite all of you to try and come out; I'm not saying that we have a Utopia, that we have really found something, that we have the real answer. We have lots of problems. But the joy of it is to go in there and work at that problem with the parents helping you. The only person you can count on being very, very truly interested is the parents. You can always count on that, no matter how down and out he may be. Thank you.

Mr. Robert Norris

Fort Wingate Elementary School, New Mexico

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Mr. Robert Norris
Fort Wingate Elementary School, New Mexico
Bureau of Indian Affairs

You have heard from my fellow tribesmen and you have been acquainted with the problems that exist in the minority groups yesterday and today. I heard some of you say, what can we do? Well for one, you can give it to the Russians or the Chinese and let them solve it. Or we could buy back the land from you and you could go back across the ocean. We had a little trouble way back in, what was it, 1598, somewhere in there. We had poor immigration laws, then.

I'm sure you're all familiar with the many treaties that have been signed with the various Indian tribes. There are about three hundred and fifty Indian tribes located across America, in all fifty states and some up in Canada, of course. And in every treaty there were five conditions that the Indians had to sign, put their thumb print on. The first, of course, is that they give up land; and the other ones followed along that order. Each time they signed a new one, the reservation got smaller. In return, they were given protection and a guarantee, perpetually. And each time there were some broken treaties on their part and it had to be re-done again. The Navajo reservation has had, according to what I can look back, as I studied it, they have had about eight treaties altogether. The last one was in 1868, and I understand that that was all done away with in 1898.

I don't know what authority we're using right now. But education was put under the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has done a 'very good job' up to this point. And a lot of the social structures which you've had in your society have 'done their part.' Now it's time to re-examine the old horse, shoot it, or do something with it, and look at the problems which the minority groups face.

The values which we live by, of course, are quite different from what you live by, not only different from the white but different from the Negro, the Spanish, the Chinese, the Japanese, these people whom I have met and whom I have gone to school with. I was born out in the middle of the reservation. I didn't have a thing. Our sheep were covered by an avalanche. We had to work for other Indian families. I went to the first school when I was about eight years old. I didn't learn a thing there except to sit in a chair. The second school I went to -- I went two years in each of these places by the way -- I at least learned how to wear a shoe. The next school I went to, I learned how to get into fights. And the fourth school I went to, I met a teacher who tried to understand. There I learned a little bit about mathematics; I caught up. I went there only two years, but I also learned English; I was able to communicate. Next, I went to a public school, and there I had to compete against the white community, those who had a good background and were able to compete. But I had to catch up. I caught up and skipped a grade. And then I went up into Canada. (This was before the sputnik affair.) I went up to Canada and I went to high school up there. And I don't know how many of you know about the matric. exam. which they have up there, but I used that credit to get into college. And I was able to take my college in two years and two quarters. And then I went back to my own people.

I tried to teach. I went into a school. I thought, "I should be prepared to teach my own people now, using the things which I have been taught in the schools, schools of education and so forth." I got in. I tried to use those things. They didn't fit in in the way my people needed help; my people needed help in a different direction. Well, I stayed there about a year and a half and then I went to the Rough Rock Demonstration School. Before this I was not able to even teach in my own language. I would like to have talked to my own people in their own language, but I couldn't. So at the Rough Rock Demonstration School I was able to teach Navajo culture and Navajo history (it's called Navajo Social Living). I taught there a year, and I was asked to come back to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I went back again. I was hired as sort of an expert, you might say. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has lots of experts; they've got truckloads of them.

Well, that's what I'm doing right now -- I'm their spokesman. Actually though, I'm the spokesman for the teachers in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We had a meeting just about a week ago before I left, and the teachers were disgusted with the way things were working. They could not meet the needs of the children. This is the aim and the purpose for this Bureau of Indian Affairs, and we could not meet the needs. We met, we talked. We had too many children; we discussed all sorts of problems. These are the things that came out of that discussion. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is all right within itself, but the people that need to be changed are the people that are what you have referred to as 'the power structure.' The teachers are willing to work, the teachers are willing to change, but we could not change. We had no communication with the persons who were responsible, those above us. Well, like they tell us, go through channels. Well, we start the channels going, and it goes all the way up to -- I don't know how far it goes before it runs out of gas.

There are some good programs which were started, such as English as a second language for Navajos. This was really something, I thought. Well, they used a textbook written for Spanish-speaking people. Another program, real good program, was to develop Navajo social studies. It was a real good program and I liked this, so I got into it. And that's where we are right now, but it's only for six weeks, not very long. The curriculum, of course, is written by college professors at the University of New Mexico, and I'm very well acquainted with them so I know what to expect from the curriculum department. (I've gone through it; I took those Mickey Mouse courses as you call them).

Next the Bureau of Indian Affairs says, "Give us money, more money. We need more money to educate the Indians." And yet, this isn't what's needed. The money that's brought in -- like I said, there's a whole truckload of specialists and experts -- never really reaches the teachers down at the bottom, or their community for that matter. That's why the teachers that can't get a job anywhere else, well, you know where they go -- they end up teaching not just Indians but all minority groups.

Needed? Quality in education. A new system of evaluation. Evaluating different minority groups is a lot different than evaluating yourselves according to your own standards. Our standards, the Navajo standards -- what's counted good in our society is cooperation. What's counted good in our society is living in nature, being able to get along with your own surroundings. Conservation -- that's an area with which we are familiar. Sense of time, sense of direction, wisdom -- these are the things that we value. I'm not sure what values other minority groups may live by. These are the things that need to be re-examined in teaching teachers.

Furthermore, there needs to be a greater dignity for the teachers. The teacher, everybody can kick him around, move him to somewhere else. We have teachers teaching English for instance, that have never had any experience in teaching English or have never studied English. I'm sure you're familiar with that in the public schools too. We need people who are willing to teach a multicultural society. Now we are speeding so fast. How long did it take you to go from your home to here? We know one another so well now, we can go from one part of the country to another part of the country. We need people who can teach the Japanese, the Chinese, the Navajo, the Iroquois, the Sioux, the white people, all kinds of white people, all kinds of black people, Spanish people. We need people like this, who can teach in a multicultural society. These are the people we want to be paid, not the people above them. These are the people who should be getting the fifteen thousand dollars a year. These are the ones carrying the load.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs, for instance, is typical of the power structure we're talking about -- I don't want to knock it around because I'm with them, but the power structure is something like a sack of laundry in a corner. You kick it. It'll accommodate you. Do anything with it you want to. And it won't do a thing. We need a new sack of laundry.

Like I said, it's time for a change, and we hope that you people will spread the word. We don't expect you people here to affect any kind of change, at least not in my opinion. But you can at least spread the word to other people, to others who are in your profession, so that they will be able to understand and so that they will be able to teach teachers who can fit in this kind of society. Your own children, your own people -- they demand change, too. We need a hard look and a new system where everyone can be heard, where we can have feedback all along the line. Those people at the bottom, people in the middle, the people at the top, all these people need feedback. We've gotten so specialized that we can't hear one another anymore.

GROUP DISCUSSION

Mr. John Dick

Mrs. Alice Neundorf

Mr. Robert Norris

GROUP DISCUSSION

Resource Persons:
Mr. John Dick, Mrs. Alice Neundorf, and Mr. Robert Norris
Navajo Reservation
Chairman: Wes Measel

Mr. Robert Norris: I'm with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and I have mixed emotions about being here. I could speak as an Indian or I could speak as a teacher of my own people. And as a teacher and as an Indian, the problem of communication has come up several times. For instance, at the school where I am, the Negroes there and the white people there have such a conflict among themselves that they don't have time really to educate the Indian people. For instance, in this area, there was a little squabble there one day. The Negro had come to me and explained to me what his thoughts were and what he felt about the white people and so forth, and then turned around to go in the next room; then white people would come to me and talk to me about what they thought about this other man. And there was no real communication.

Participant: Can I ask you a question? I'm from Tempe in Arizona, and I know a few people who have worked on the Rough Rock Project, I know, personally, very little about the project. Hopefully, we will become involved in it in the future -- in curriculum development and this type of thing. But what has been your experience with the people coming in to help you with this Rough Rock Project? Is there any kind of real communication? I get the feeling from the way the people in Phoenix talked to me that there is not a real dialogue.

Mr. John Dick: I am very grateful to answer any questions you have. I do not speak English. I wish I could speak where I can communicate with you completely and answer your questions. I'm very grateful to be here among you all.

Here is the school. This is our school. There is the white man's school. There is the government school. There is the mission school. But this is our school. We gather people. We inform them. They come all around here to this school to hear what we have to say. And we ask them, "Speak for your children. How do you want us to teach your children? What do you want for your children?" And they tell us what they want. I am a member of the school board. At the beginning when the school was first turned over to the Navajo people, we and the rest of the community were very observant. We didn't want to take part in it; we didn't know what it was. It was new and all the people asked questions; they were hesitant; they didn't know. And when the school board came into operation, we made a policy that we would have a meeting every month and all these people would be invited to join in and we would ask each one to participate in the school. We had to teach them that this school was going to be a school where they had a voice. They were taken to the classrooms. They were taken to every area of their school so they would learn. And now they are learning about the school and they are finally beginning to accept the school as theirs. In the years before, all the schools we ever knew about were schools that were just there. We looked in from the outside. In this school, we looked from the inside out and we are trying to make it work.

This school is primarily concerned with children. How can we best meet the needs of children as children, not as adults, not what we want them to be when they grow up. We are including our own culture, trying to give equal time to what they have had before they have come to school. And we, as a community, are trying to include other people besides our own community. We are having Navajo people coming from all over the different parts of the reservation, coming over to observe, to see for themselves what is going on, what they hear about. And we are open to all who want to learn our ways of doing things.

Participant: This then would include the people who do come up from the University?

Mr. Alice Neundorf: Yes.

Participant: If I come to visit or work with you, how can you help me to understand and communicate with the young people whom I would meet?

Mr. Dick: First of all, we have a school policy which is probably different from other schools. We ask teachers to be flexible in many, many different ways. There are differences in many different people. Look at me. I dress different. I talk different. And here I am in the minority in a group. And how I would approach your children would be the way probably you would approach my children. I would want to know. I would want to find out. But if you were to come to the reservation to be a teacher, I would want you to respect my children as Navajos with their own language, with their own culture, with many, many of the things that go along with what they have learned before they have come to the school.

Mr. Norris: First of all, depending on the part of the reservation where you are going to, you would go directly to the child and just talk to them. Most of them understand English, although there could be a few that don't. In that case, the best thing you can do is to get one of the children to interpret for you -- that way they know that you're there, you're genuine, you want to be their friend. And try to pick up a word or two; this would help, because they need to know that they have their own social structure, their own social system, their own customs and their own language. This needs to be respected. It's not just a person -- there's a Navajo and here's a white person (sometimes they're called pink). But it's not this man against this man so much as this *society*, this *culture*, against this *culture*. These people over here are just as smart as I am. These people over here are just as well off as I am, on this basis.

Participant: And you aren't associated with the Rough Rock School?

Mr. Norris: I taught there one year, last year.

Participant: Which do you think is doing the most for the Navajo children, the Rough Rock Demonstration School or the B.I.A. School?

Mr. Norris: I would say Rough Rock Demonstration School. There were certain reasons why I had to go back for a year to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It was sort of a compensatory thing.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs wanted to experiment in this new area called Navajo Culture or cultural identification courses. I went back because I wanted to go into this area. I took a cut in pay, but I went back anyway. When I got there I was given a regular class. So this is where things stand right now. But I am familiar with the Bureau of Indian Affairs because I worked with them a year before I went to the Rough Rock Demonstration School.

Participant: How do I avoid making some stupid mistakes? Every culture has cultural patterns. Let me give an example. I read a folder on a youngster because I want to know his background and interests so I don't make the stupid mistake of saying, "Why don't you go home and talk this over with your mother?" when I know she doesn't have a mother.

Mr. Norris: You have to remember that if you went to the Rough Rock Demonstration School it would be different. But if you went to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and you talked to the child, there you have to remember that they're at a boarding school; they're away from their parents. The Bureau of Indian Affairs took this child from the reservation and put him in a boarding school, shut off from all contact with his parents for nine months. Sometimes they are allowed to go home every month or every two months, depending on what the school policy is there. But as far as approaching the child himself is concerned, your best bet would be just to go and talk to him -- most of them do understand you.

Participant: What's the general attitude of the children toward two cultures in the schools? Is the school attempting to indoctrinate them in a culture which is not their own? Or is the school attempting to indoctrinate them in two cultures?

Mr. Norris: Perhaps the best way really is to go back into the policies of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. After the treaty periods, the B.I.A. established these schools. For instance, on our reservation, a hundred years ago -- this is our centennial year -- in 1868 they established school policy. (I understand the treaty went out of effect in 1898, but we still live by it). There was to be one teacher for every thirty children. It's supposed to be the same way right now, but last year one teacher there had sixty beginners or first graders in one classroom, and this is still going on. But as far as the children themselves are concerned they're being indoctrinated into a new culture -- taken out of their own culture and put into a situation where they are no longer taught.

They're no longer Navajos. But just recently, within the past year, things are beginning to change just a little bit, just a tiny bit; but I don't expect much out of this. I took a poll just last summer, this past year, of the children that were in my group. I had a hundred and fifty. There were three teachers and a hundred and fifty kids. One of the questions was "Who is smarter? The white man or the Navajo?"

About ninety per cent said, "The white man."
"Who is happier? The white man or the Navajo?"
"The Navajo is happier."

There were all kinds of values that were just in conflict with one another and they were all mixed up within themselves. They don't really know where they belong. They don't know their language well enough to communicate with their parents. Anyway, there is still that generation gap. So they're really alienated from their parents. And they don't know the new language well enough to really communicate with what we call the 'dominant society.'

Participant: Who is the teacher likely to be? Is the teacher likely to be a Navajo or is the teacher likely to be a white?

Mr. Norris: White and black, I would say. I don't know what the percentage is, but there are lots of black people and then there are the white people, lots of them. Very few Navajos, because what can you do in this situation? The Indian child when he goes to school is taken completely out. A great majority drop out by the time they reach high school because, like I said, they have so many cultural conflicts they don't know what to do. They don't know what they're going for. Education isn't relevant to them.

Participant: How about the Rough Rock School? Are they mostly Navajo teachers?

Mr. Norris: Yes. As far as I know. Isn't that right?

Mrs. Neundorf: We try very, very hard to get Navajo teachers even though they may not hold a degree or they may not have a teaching certificate as prescribed by the state.

Participant: So that your teachers really are bi-cultural then?

Mrs. Neundorf: Yes. The way it is right now, everything goes out the window except what Mr. Dick and his group set as policy. If they want to hire someone who has never finished high school but is competent, in their thinking, to take their kids and teach them, this is what we do. As a matter of fact, one of our very best teachers has gone up to about the eighth or tenth grade. And she is taking over the beginning class. She speaks both English and Navajo.

Participant: Can you tell us about the woman in the Navajo culture?

Mrs. Neundorf: I'm not sure, but I think what you want to know is how do I behave if I set foot on the Navajo reservation. There are fundamental things. Probably I could list about ten things which are different values in our Navajo culture from the modern society. One is on time: we go by the sun; we don't go by the clock, which means to set an appointment at eight o'clock would mean not very much unless this person that we are making the appointment with knows the time and also has a watch. Also, on religion: a Navajo who is trained in his culture very well, lives his religion by the day and lives with nature as his religion, not a God somewhere else. This would also mean that if he has a bad dream, maybe he would have to take certain steps. If you were on a trip with another person, he may have to have his own prayer and his own silent moments. Being in a hurry to speak: a person may be a brilliant person but he doesn't have to let everyone know that he is, until asked to speak. To be slow in making decisions but to make sure that the decision is the right one or is perhaps the best one. And also, never to be in a hurry to do things because where we are, we are not really concerned with time. We don't have buses or planes to catch. But it is changing. And I think what we are is in direct conflict with the modern society, and it's killing us -- because of what we are psychologically. It's a very sad story.

Participant: It seems to me that with all the Indian children that are being taught, we ought to learn something from their culture. We've tried, and I think as we looked at the history of the Bureau of Indian Affairs there has always been a hint of this attempt to assimilate both the Indian and the white man's cultures. I can see where this is a schizophrenic conflict for the Indian who is in both cultures, and yet not in any culture. He's really cast adrift, and that's what she means by being psychologically killed.

Mr. Norris: Well in regard to this, I heard a story about one college graduate. He was an Indian. He was graduated, got his master's, and of course, he went back to the reservation and he got his sheep and horses and goats and cattle and so on. And he was sitting out beside his windmill taking it easy and along came somebody that knew one of his professors, and asked him what he was doing now. So he told him he was just taking it easy. And in the course of conversation, of course, this Indian fellow showed him that he had all he needed in life. If he wanted meat, there was the meat right there. If he wanted to go for a ride, just get on one of his horses and go. If he wanted to go fishing, he could just go out and do it himself any old time. And he's happy at this. Whereas you, you get ulcers; you have to do this; you have to get all these things; you have to be better than everybody else; you have to compete with everything. In everything you do, you have to compete with somebody else. This is the type of situation that we are talking about.

Participant: Now what do you do with a young person growing up in this kind of situation? I'm a third generation Scandinavian. My grandparents all came from Sweden, and there was no problem to assimilate us into the American culture. There was a generation gap between the Swedes who talked Swedish in their homes and the kids who didn't. The old people died off and we swung over in the other direction. But in your case, you're trying to keep this culture going. Is it something that you're treasuring that you ought not to be treasuring, Bob?

Mr. Norris: Well, let's take the idea of co-operation: the Navajo, or the Indians generally speaking, value co-operation whereas you value competition. There are other areas like 'time,' which Mrs. Neundorf mentioned. Perhaps you don't know it, but on the Navajo reservation, there are a hundred and twenty thousand Navajo people. This is the largest reservation in the United States. Other reservations are relatively small, some less than a hundred members, which would be similar to your case, for instance. But in a large minority group like this, the cultural changes will have to come slow.

Participant: I see. In other words, you're in one group all together.

Mr. Norris: Right. It's not jumping from one into the other. It's a matter of a slow change.

Mrs. Neundorf: We are thinking carefully about what we should take and what we should leave. And I am a Navajo who has gone as far as I can go in your culture, taking the things that I liked and leaving the things I didn't like. Sometimes it may not have been a wise choice in many areas, but there was no one over me to tell me these things.

The way I feel, if education, the way it was dished out by the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the last forty years, is going to result in the kind of people that we have now, I say to hell with it. We need something new. We need something like the school at Rough Rock where somebody cares, instead of having to take your children out and put them in school and shut yourself off, instead of having to have teachers that come around, that do not know anything about these children, forcing these children to be regimented little tiny soldiers who march to school. What kind of people do they turn out? By the time they're in the eighth grade, they drop out and they start drinking. Drinking has always been a problem with the Indians because it's a way out. Another way out is the peyote religion. It has a special service to these people. It's a different way out. It's a better way out than being drunk in the streets. I have somehow survived these things.

There is no way of telling you how it feels to be dragged out of your home when you are six years old and to be put in a place that is practically a prison. I am not speaking very lightly of this. I get pretty emotional about it myself because this is what's happening now. It hasn't happened only when I was in school; it's happening now, and was happening for the last forty years. We are to be made over at any cost, billions of dollars, by the government, to become American middle class people. We are not succeeding in this, and the teachers are not succeeding, because there is no real need for it. It's just destroying us; it's not doing any good for us.

You may wonder, "Why is she saying that, when she was fairly successful in every way in this sort of thing?" Perhaps the reason I have survived is that I had my parents behind me. Whenever I went home I had the affection, all the things that a child needs. And I had some brothers and sisters who are older than me that were working in the school. This was a great comfort to me. My father had a way of adjusting to a lot of things which probably helped a great deal. Not very many children have this kind of thing, where the parents are pulling one way and the teachers are pulling another way. Once a child is brought into the school, he is being told, "The better way is our way." A teacher doesn't have to say this. The child comes in the classroom with a clean shirt pressed, a tie, a suit, and the first thing the teacher does is take him and wash him, take the bugs out of his hair, and all these little delicate ways of doing things to show this child that where he came from is lower, is not up to standard. "It's not our way of doing things. It's not the better way of doing things. I can show you that I am being successful because I have money, I have a car, I have all these nice things. I eat nicely, I sleep in a clean bed." This kind of attitude rubs off very fast and leaves a child with a degraded feeling of a very insecure connection with family. And when you go home like I did, you see a lot of dirt, you see a lot of things that your teacher taught you to see and yet you love your parents and there's a terrible conflict within yourself as to what your ideals are now. And it cracks up a lot of people.

Participant: Do the Navajo people feel that the textbook material that we use, if there is any, treats their culture with the right perspective and as fairly as you might wish it to?

Mr. Dick: Ever since I got involved there were, as I remember, about forty-five minutes given each day to the children's education in our own culture. Textbooks are not equipped to do this. As a matter of fact, there is nothing equipped for our children in our schools. We have put aside time for these children to learn about their own language and their own culture now. Before, there was none that I know of. When I came to know the school, there was nothing that I know of that even mentioned Indian people at all in the schools. It was as if the child didn't know his mother, the child didn't know his parents.

Participant: Is the material on the Indians in the curriculum in schools in the Southwest an accurate view of Navajo culture or Indian culture generally speaking? Or is it a myth?

Mr. Norris: There are no views expressed as far as I can see in the textbooks that I have examined. There is a lack of material dealing with the people in the Southwest. The B.I.A. for instance, decided when Rough Rock was set up to play around with the idea of starting Navajo social studies. This is primarily what I'm doing back with the B.I.A., helping them set up a course in Navajo Social Studies. This material is primarily put out by the University of New Mexico, and to my mind, this isn't co-ordinated with the Navajo tribe as yet. In other words, the University is putting out the material without consulting the tribe itself as to what other work has been done in that area. Is this what you meant?

Participant: Well, each of our elementary schools has a third grade unit about the Indians you know. I question the validity of it.

Mr. Norris: What units there are on Indians of the Southwest have to be worked out by the teachers themselves.

Participant: It's probably largely based either on misinformation or myth. I just wonder what we ought to do about that. Should we suggest that they go easy, cut it out completely, or get some accurate information or what?

Mrs. Neundorf: We have in our school at the project what we call the Navajo Curriculum Center and we have some very competent people who are gathering information, as much as the people will give up. They are very wary of the kind of things they want to give up. Whenever they have trusted someone with a story what has been done is to exploit it. It has been put before the public at a profit to someone else. And when we go in all sincerity and all seriousness to get these materials we have a hard time, and very rightly so, I guess. When we do get stories, some of the medicine men do not want to get paid for this. Others, of course, have learned to play the game and get as much out of it as possible. Right now, we are trying to write the Navajo history. And it's a very tough task because there are views on every side from every corner of the reservation on this. And to try and satisfy everyone's views, sometimes we even wonder whether we should have four books, rather than just one book, written on the whole subject matter, because it's mythologically involved, it's religious. A Navajo lives his religion. Also, the dialect changes from area to area. This is the kind of problem we are facing. And we are also writing some other books that would be used in very low grades, so beginning children can learn to "get used to books" before they learn to attack another language.

Mr. Norris: In other words, all across the board in educational textbooks, not only in history but in English and all these other areas -- math, science, and so forth -- all these textbooks are written primarily for the average student, say, in Chicago suburbs. They have no real relevance to what's going on in the Southwest.

Mrs. Neundorf: I think that Bob has put his finger on something. Sometimes I think that all of us, the minority groups, are riding the coattails of the colored man. And I think they say that we still have a chance; we still have something to fight for. But I think they're missing the point on one thing. The colored man has something to fight, something visible, something that he can point out to people, it's easy to see. But we have something that's invisible. It's indifference that we have to face. It's the little things. It doesn't perhaps bother us physically, but like I said yesterday, it's killing us off psychologically in so many different ways. And one of the things is the indifference to the Indian history. How many of you know anything about Indian history or have been told anything or read anything about it in colleges? And yet from the beginning of the settlement of this country, it was time after time after time that Indians were involved in every way. And the tragedies that go with it, it's no wonder that only maybe a page and a half in American history is devoted to Indians. The way I feel, as a person who is involved in the change, is like the person in between. What use is it to fight when you know the history of failures of fighting, trying to keep the kind of things that has been kept? We have lost time after time after time as Indians all across the nation. And what use is it to go and fight the same way as the colored man is trying? And I don't know. I think a lot of people feel this way. And one other thing is just maybe to turn away and hang on to something that you still have. Even that is under attack by daily instructions to your children that theirs is not the best way and someone else is more successful.

Participant: In the school project that you're doing how are you teaching or suggesting to your children to carry on what you feel is important? How are you training them to become teachers of another culture, leaders in their own culture, to preserve what they have and pass down these traditions? Are you teaching them to be passivists or to become activists? I mean your approach is entirely different from Mr. Chambers' approach yesterday.

Mrs. Neundorf: Like I say, no, we don't have anything visible to fight. I can't tell my children, "Now this is the kind of things you're going to meet when you go through life." It happens so unwittingly on their part. And even the educated people, are telling us, "You have lost. Forget it. Look at Greece. Look at Rome. Where are they? Look at all these other places. They had great empires. They had everything. You don't even have enough to even make a mark in history. Forget it. Try to just melt. That's about the only thing you can do." I mean I had people tell me this in the face. "You are fighting a lost cause. Forget it." Is it really that great to melt in the melting pot, so to speak? Nobody melts really. But is it really great to have everything that the modern society has to offer? I had everything. I've gone all the way to the top, as much as I can. But when I go home, I am more relaxed; I am a lot happier in many other different ways. And the only thing I can do to convey some of this to the children (a lot of it will have to be experienced) is to let them know that there is no right or wrong way of living. If they choose any way of living that they want to, this is up to them; but they should experience as much as they can. And I think what we're trying to give them at the school is some backbone, in a sense -- something that they can rely on. The psychologists tell us that if you don't have a home base to start from, you're not very much of a person to experience and come through in the end as an enriched person. This is the kind of thing we're trying to give the children, as much as we know how.

Participant: What do you think we can do as teachers and as trainers of teachers to prepare kids, to prepare students in college to teach in a multi-racial situation?

Mr. Norris: What you're asking here is how do we expect another group of people to teach our children about our society, our way of living. To begin with, in the training of teachers, there needs to be a complete change in the direction of what the speakers have been talking about -- training them to be tolerant to all kinds of different nationalities, cultures and society, and to find out what other peoples' values are, what the cultural conflicts these students experience. Then we should attempt to meet these problems as much as possible. For instance, the Navajo students respect nature; they like to live with nature. You would attempt to change this -- take the rock for instance, move this rock, move this out of the way, set up a house -- whereas we would try to live with nature. We would not bother the rock; we would attempt to make use of the natural surroundings to set up our own house. And another area is co-operation: we like to co-operate. Whenever we choose a leader, it's a co-operative effort, it's not the majority rule. Of course, this is changing as culture changes, but this is the way it used to be set up: if a person did not have the backing of the whole community, then he was not elected. It may take one or two days just to get a discussion leader, but at least whoever was chosen was truly the representative of the community. He was not the spokesman for just the majority or whoever was dominating the discussion. This is why some of these VISTA workers would come in and they would attempt to help the people to set up some sort of power structure, some sort of a community organization. And so they would come in and they would have a quick poll or election. And they would count the ballots, of course, and they would elect somebody. Well, the people would go home and talk it over. "We don't like what happened. We know who the ones that were elected were. We know who the main ones that were running for office were. Well, let's talk about this." And they talk about it among themselves. "This one isn't necessarily the one that's going to be talking for us. Let's see if we can get somebody else." So the next day maybe somebody else they bring forward and that might be the real representative for the whole community. And the VISTA worker or whoever it may be may still be working with the other one that was -- well, I guess you could call it 'de-elected.'

Mrs. Neundorf: What I have been thinking about a long, long time -- it is a terrible thing probably to say -- is, in my ignorance I chose the right profession perhaps because I like to work with people. And I think our whole nation as a mammoth thing has the wrong value on things, on some things. Like for instance, the value put on people that are smart and that can go into something and sit out in their ivory tower or something that we can all bow down to. I think the value should be put on people that have the talent to work with people, people that have the talent to roll up their sleeves and get themselves involved and get their feet wet and really change things down at what we call in our situation the 'hogan level.' And even I get myself involved in bowing down to all the doctors and all the nurses and all the lawyers and all the scientists. We need them. But I think we have created such great things, and yet we are losing ourselves, we are losing our soul. And I think it's because of our value structure. How do you change your values? I would rather respect someone that can make one person who has never known happiness in his life happy for one day. Maybe we are changing; I don't know.

[At this point, Mr. Dick, Mrs. Neundorf, and Mr. Norris were called to attend another meeting.]

Participant: The problem that I see in this is, what about the Sioux, what about the Cheyenne, and what about the others that are on reservations? I'm not trying to discount the Navajos' problems; I'm just saying we have so many different minority groups; is there any way that you can treat all of the Indians in a sort of a unit on Indians?

Participant: But when you do a unit on Europe, you don't cover every country on the third-grade level. You take Holland or something and say this is one country; this is how these people live; and they have windmills.

Participant: Navajo would be representative of all Indian cultures.

Participant: No. It's just one culture and the way one minority group lives.

Participant: That is their problem. I talked to Bob Norris a good deal and he doesn't care so much about everybody else knowing about the problem, he cares about Navajos knowing about Navajos. And in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, they're not even allowed to speak Navajo to the Navajo children in a Navajo classroom. This is true in the Cheyenne and Sioux and everything else: the Bureau of Indian Affairs School squelched the culture.

Participant: Well, isn't that what our American schools have done to every foreign culture that comes in?

Participant: Sure. We do the same thing to the Mexican-Americans.

Participant: So I asked him, "What do you do? Do you change the Bureau of Indian Affairs?" He said, "You can't change the Bureau of Indian Affairs."

Participant: What we can do about this situation, of course, is to work with the power structure. We might be able to muster enough political influence to change the Bureau of Indian Affairs. But we can't go home and sit down and say, "Well, I'm going to make a third grade unit on the Navajo Indians to teach my kids in school." I don't think that's the solution to the problem at all.

Participant: Well it might help from the standpoint of understanding that these people did have a culture. I think that this cowboy and Indian stuff that they've had for so long has been misleading; maybe if you don't do anything else, you'd write the television writers and say, 'get those programs off the air and get something honest on the air.'

Participant: I think that in time this kind of a nationwide change in attitude and curriculum would eventually solve the problem. But they're worried about the kids right now.

Participant: Another problem too gave me insight into why they feel you cannot change the B.I.A. -- they did not sponsor the Rough Rock Project, and they did not condone it. They said, "Go ahead. Sink or swim." It turned out very well; then, of course, the B.I.A. got on the bandwagon. What does the B.I.A. plan to do to expand it? I don't think they plan to do anything to expand it. If they do, where do our B.I.A. schools go, and the multi-millions of dollars gone into these beautiful buildings all over the reservation? That's a big establishment. Compare it to the government moving their bases and closing down certain bases all over the world. That was a tremendous step to take and much criticism was derived by this step, wasting money and all of this. It took a great deal of power to do that.

Participant: Why not have the B.I.A. people go to new Rough Rock projects and work in these capacities, or in their central offices dealing with the problems of many many other Rough Rock experiments. You see, that's one solution.

Participant: And then there are some parents who would choose to have their child leave the hogan and go off to the B.I.A. schools.

Participant: I wonder if this is the issue at all, because it seems to me that from what I understand, the B.I.A. is under tremendous pressure from elements to close down and get the government out of the Indian business. This is the pressure that they are facing. And in fact, I think the trend is to close down B.I.A. schools. I think the school population is declining in B.I.A. schools, and they are reluctant to sponsor this type of project because of the pressure. Are we going to close down the government sponsorship of the Indians? We want to get them into the white society before we get out of the Indian business, so they are afraid of any kind of pressure that will maintain any kind of cultural pluralism. I think it gets into a more basic question which ties in with what these people are about -- to what extent will you really believe in cultural pluralism, which is supposed to be a part of our ideology? We're so afraid that if we sponsor individual cultural enclaves we're not going to co-operate on essential matters; I don't share this fear.

Participant: But I think that we have to be honest about this as people sitting in here. What would you do if you were in B.I.A.? I've known some people in this and they've been perplexed with this problem. Do we really make the Indian a part of the overall American culture, or do we set him aside? Now, they have to make a choice; we have to make a choice on this. And to set them aside on a reservation bypasses much of what we would call the American culture. There may be a potential Indian doctor there, a potential Indian senator, or there might be a lot of potential there of people who could be leaders in our country. If we bypass them, we just say, "Well you're a part of your own culture. We don't include you." I think the B.I.A. people are really serious in their intent to take a look at the whole problem. What do you do? And we can't just use the B.I.A. as a whipping boy, necessarily. With our own experience we have to really find out what we would do if we were in the B.I.A. Over the nearly one hundred years, we've had the problem, they've shifted from here to here to here. And I don't think that each new administration that comes in decides they're going to do it this way. There are people of long tenure there that are genuine in their concern about what we should do.

Participant: But have you ever consulted an Indian as to what he would like to have done?

THE FARM WORKER

Mr. Jim Drake

The Farm Worker: Jim Drake

Mr. Drake is Administrative Assistant of the United Farm Workers in Delano, California; he is, thus, one of Cesar Chavez's chief assistants. The problems of which Mr. Drake speaks are not problems faced only in areas where the United Farm Workers are strong; they are equally great in areas where farm workers are numerous and their sense of power weak. The problems are not unique to the migrant or Mexican-American communities of the western part of the United States. Over fifty per cent of the people in rural America have been displaced by technology in the last ten years; many of these people were Black southern sharecroppers -- farm workers -- displaced by cotton picking and cultivating machinery; the Black ghettoes of the north have been filled with them. Another group has been forced off marginal land or off "family farms" by a combination of forces: government farm policy, the corporate farm technological development. The white ghettoes are filling with such people. About fifty per cent of the children -- Black and white -- in Mississippi are not in school, and they and their parents will come to be part of yet other ghettoes. No serious programs exist, in education, either to change the direction of what is happening to the countryside or to allow rural people who move to urban areas to equip themselves with the tools -- intellectual and vocational -- to cope in urban settings with dignity. Most of America's poor people, and a very high proportion of the people "shut out" of education or "turned off" by it, are rural people.

The conventional cry today is against the misery of the inner city school. One hears few people saying anything about the drabness, the anti-intellectualism, the lack of definition of intelligent function, and the lack of perception of responsibility to urban society which characterizes the rural and small town school in America today. To Jim Drake, to the migrant and the settled farm workers whom he serves, education is at best "somebody else's game" and the enemy:

> School teachers say, "God, I hope I can get this kid so he can get out of that rut. *Well, why in the hell get out of that rut*? Why not help the kids' father and stand with him in trying to make a dignified profession of it."

* * *

> Anybody that teaches in Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico should be able to speak Spanish, or they're not communicating with the kids or the parents.

* * *

> The way to cut off this machine . . . , this power machine is with another machine. So they [Higher Education] came up with the mechanical grape picker. . . . We've had . . . doctors, seminary students, historians, almost every kind of student under the sun, come to Delano to talk to us and see what the problem of the farm worker . . . is; but we haven't had one goddamn student teacher come.

The rest of Mr. Drake's talk is of what schools are and where the teacher's loyalty lies, or ought to lie. It is of what teachers need to know and to be; it is of our learning "to be at the mercy" of other people and of our learning something about creation of communities.

Mr. Jim Drake
United Farm Workers, Delano, California

I've been perplexed all day; I can't figure out what I'm doing here, because for the Farm Worker's Union, which is made up predominantly of Mexican-Americans and Filipino-Americans and black Americans and poor white Americans in the San Joaquin Valley of California, the whole education system is just a joke; we don't even talk about it; we just laugh. So we don't even talk about getting control of school boards or participating in decision-making processes that would affect farm workers. I haven't even thought of it until today.

I think the major reason is basically that farm workers can't vote. There are a number of reasons why farm workers can't vote. A lot of them are Mexican citizens; that makes it a little difficult to vote, in this country anyway. But they have children here, and their children go to school here. If they're not Mexican citizens and international migrants, then they're migrants across county and state lines and they're not in one county long enough to register to vote. So we've had very bad experiences with schools and I think schools have had bad experiences with farm workers. There are a lot of programs developed for farm workers' kids, and they're all just so many farces.

I think the basic reason is that our society has a school system which is developed in such a way that it's meant to provide a commodity for the market -- the well-rounded mediocrity that goes to college and then fits into the upper echelons of our society that control the little people down here. So we have Columbia University preparing for a war this year over the sources of their money and the sources of their power. And we have the University of California at Davis preparing for a war this year, because for years and years they've turned out machines and ideas and systems for agriculturalists in California, which have amassed huge amounts of money for a very small five per cent of the farm workers in the state.

Now that a union has come along and decided that it's going to help farm workers and they are developing their own ideas and own plans for grasping a little bit of that power that we've just been talking about, the growers go to the Giannini Foundation and to Emperor Reagan and ask that these peasants down here be put back in their place, which is supposed to be slavery; the way to cut off this machine which they're developing, this power machine, is with another machine -- mechanize them out of business, plow them under. So they come up with the mechanical grape picker; they come up with the mechanical almond shaker -- whoever thought of shaking almonds out of the tree with a machine? They come up with a machine that blocks sugar beets so that they won't need Mexicans anymore -- that beautiful breed that the growers always talked about, built short and close to the ground so that they can use a short handled hoe. They won't be needed anymore, they won't have a need for a union or any reason to have any power. And all of this is a result of our education system.

But I don't want to blame the education system alone, because the education system is merely the cogs of the machine by which we police the whole world and the system by which we control the world, the system by which we are careful to keep our supremacy on this globe. I didn't used to believe this until I saw what happened in Chicago; I'm kind of a conservative guy anyway. And my father's a teacher, my sister is a teacher. I don't talk to them anymore.

Some of you shake your heads: I don't know if you're shaking your heads because you're sorry it's that way or because you don't agree with me. I didn't used to think it was true but I believe it now; I believe it because I've been involved for six years with a ragged bunch of farm workers who are trying to form a union, and almost every goddamn weapon that this government has, has been used to keep them from having it. For instance, say they strike within two hundred miles of the Mexican border: two thousand workers leave the field and they leave the complete area; the grapes are there, and you've pulled your power play. The government says, "Well, we're not sure about the law, whether or not Mexicans from across the border can come and break strikes, but we'll have to take it to the Supreme Court and decide. Meantime, we'll have to employ them because it has to be settled that way." So the strike is broken and the grapes are harvested. What's the use of building power if the government is going to use its ability to allow strike breakers to come across the border ?

What if the white teachers decided to strike in New York City, and Mayor Lindsay wired up to the mayor of Toronto and said, "Send me down three thousand teachers because we need some scabs, " and they came? There would be blood in the streets.

Mr. Griffiths: We have scabs working now.

Mr. Drake: Maybe there ought to be blood in the streets. But more and more as we deal with the local school board system and the way that the local school board in rural America deals with conflict in its community, I'm becoming convinced that the school system is the hatchery for all those big roosters that go around crowing all over the country, and that it's through the hatchery system that we incubate them and we send them up to the university, where they become the C.I.A. of the world, that we're bogged down in a fantastically impossible situation. Therefore, if the local teacher who wants to do something about it, he stands up and says something about it, he becomes just a bloody mess, because he is a nonentity.

In Delano, the school board is made up of growers and if the teachers wanted to stand up and say, "Cesar Chavez's kids, all eight of them, have the right to wear *huelga* buttons to school that say that they believe in what their father is working for," the board, made up of growers, would just can them like that. So they don't say anything.

We talked about this in our discussion group and I commiserated a little bit. It just seems to me that if teachers think that anything that I'm saying has any validity, and if they think it is true that our society is being nursemaided by the school system, then they had better organize and they had better make coalitions -- and it had better not be with growers if you want to make any changes for the better. It ought to be with poor people, it ought to be with black people, it ought to be with the students -- the right students -- the *left* students. And I think, finally, that the students who are planning on being teachers ought to spend some time in the communities where they're going to teach, looking at things, seeing what's going on, before they get out there. And then they're going to be able to communicate with those other students in the university.

I just want to say that in three years of strike in Delano, we've had student social workers, we've had student dental technicians and student nurses, we've had guys that are planning to be doctors, we've had seminary students, historians, almost every kind of student under the sun, come to Delano to talk to us and see what the problem of the farm worker trying to get in the union is; *but we haven't had one goddamn student teacher come*. I don't know if they don't know where Delano is or they don't read the newspapers or what, but they're sure welcome. We hope they come.

GROUP DISCUSSION

THE FARM WORKER

Mr. Jim Drake

GROUP DISCUSSION

Resource Person:
Mr. Jim Drake
Farm Workers Organizing Committee, Delano, California
Chairman: John Fisher

Mr. Jim Drake: I don't want to say things that are going to direct the whole discussion into talking about farm workers' kids, because I think that should just be kind of a launching pad for what needs to take place. But I have to speak out of my own experience, and I think I should tell you a little bit about what my experience is and who I am in order for it to make any sense. Most of you, I hope, know that in California for about five years now we've been carrying on an effort to organize the Farm Workers Union. It's dealt mostly with the grape industry in the Delano, California, area and the Delano grape strike. The director of our union, which we like to think of as a movement more than a union, is Cesar Chavez. Cesar's image is pretty well stamped on the whole farm worker movement in the country now, and that's an image of building a whole new community, a whole new set of relationships between farm workers and the power structure they have to deal with all the time. When we say power structure, we're not talking about only the growers; we're talking about that whole Bank of America complex of California. So when we talk about education, we're talking about school boards that are made up of growers or fertilizer salesmen or pesticide salesmen or men who are bankers in the Bank of America or in the growers' own bank in the community, whatever they call it. So in the San Joaquin Valley, as in most agricultural areas of our nation, when we talk about taking on the power structure, we're really talking about taking on the schools as part of that whole structure.

I think the biggest difficulty is that school teachers can't be teachers with the present set of values that school boards project because teachers are forced by school boards in our valley, as I see it, to produce commodities and not to shape or help shape human beings. Their job is to produce a commodity that's saleable to the universities, so if you get an odd-shaped piece of raw material that doesn't fit into the machine, you try to chew it up and remake it; and if it doesn't come out right, then you throw it away. And those that get thrown away pick grapes. By and large, those are Mexican-American kids, and black kids, and Filipino kids and very poor white kids. So it seems to me that we can't begin to talk about a sensible teaching program until we talk about changing the base of power and finding a way to change the whole purpose of education from producing a commodity to changing communities.

As we go to communities, we find that teachers seem to be the most vulnerable of any group when we go and ask them for their help. In other words, we have clergy groups across the nation, we have student groups, we have black groups, we have Mexican-American organizations, all kinds of groups of people who are helpful, but teachers seem to be most vulnerable when they want to help us. I imagine that that's true in anything that teachers want to do in their own communities, because they work, by and large, for bureaucracies which are intent on maintaining the status quo and developing the status quo towards some idea of perfection rather than changing the whole unjust situation that people live in. The only time we find teachers that aren't like this is when they live in a small community and try to form a union of their own. Then they know what we're up against as farm workers trying to form a union. Then *they're* in the minority and then *they* have to fight for their survival. I have an interesting example of Klamath Falls, Oregon, where we have a boycott committee made up of two teachers. They came to Delano and decided that they would speak out in their communities about the problems of the farm worker in Delano trying to organize. Immediately they ran into the president of the school board who owns a big cold storage plant and stores potatoes for the winter. And who grows potatoes? Growers. And who belongs to the same organization as the grape grower? Other growers. Potato growers and grape growers all belong to the Farm Bureau. And those two teachers stuck their necks way out, and I don't know if they knew what was going to happen or whether they were naive about it, but cannons started going off everywhere and they had to pull in their necks. But in that case they'd also had some experience trying to organize a union; they had a small handful of teachers and were able to unite enough to protect their rights there. And pretty soon, a fragment of organized labor came to their defense, and it was kind of a "they lived happily ever after" story. But that very seldom happens in a small rural community.

On the West Coast, the basic concept of our school system and our whole education system is to produce a well-finished product that fits in well and blends into the scenery. In Delano the biggest issue, of course, is the strike. The kids force the issue all the time at school. They wear buttons to school and the principal says, "No, you can't wear that goddamn button. Get that button off or else you're going to get out of school. You have no right to wear that button." What he's saying is, "If you wear that button, I'm going to have to put up with the school board, which is made up of growers, and they're going to either get rid of me or I'm going to get rid of the kids." But the kids wear the buttons and they organize because they have to to survive. They want to stay in school. But they're not going to say that what their parents are doing is wrong, which is what the teacher's saying. "Your parents must be some kind of nut to want more money." Of course, I never hear that from a school teacher. "Your parents have no right to organize a union or try to get more money out of our boss, the grower." So the kids organize, and the teachers either realize and don't do anything about it or don't realize it at all. But one of the most fantastic things that's going on in our whole society is taking place right there in their own community -- one of the most historic events; and they won't let the kids talk about it in school. They have one of the most respected and innovative leaders in our whole society, Cesar Chavez, in their own community and they would never allow him to come on the campus.

That's all going to change, because the farm worker is going to change the power structure of that community. What I want to say is that school teachers, it seems to me, have to take the same risks in a situation like that that the parents of the kids that they're teaching take -- that is, to be fired and to go through the mill and be forced to organize. Until they do that, they're not going to be able to take up the real stuff of education, which is, as we heard so much today, building human beings and trying to develop a peaceful world in which to live, in which we don't destroy each other. School teachers in Delano will just have to learn, for instance, not to be afraid of conflict and tension, because that's the stuff that you negotiate with and that you bring resolutions with.

Cesar's nephew in Delano, Freddie Chavez, is a senior in the one high school in town. The teachers didn't realize what was happening -- they thought probably that the growers, which are very much the minority, still controlled the scene -- but last year, Freddie Chavez ran for senior class president and won by an overwhelming majority. And so the political structure is changing within the school, whether the teachers want it or not. And the kids are going to determine what the teachers are going to say because the teachers didn't have either enough courage or enough insight to realize what was going on and to lead them and to help shape them. I can foresee the time when the kids are going to want to shape policy and are going to run right into the same thing that their fathers and mothers are running into, and that's the picket line. That's the only way to change policy in Delano so far. So that's what happens when there isn't an aggressive, perceptive body of teachers who stand with the kids some place along the line, or with the kids' parents who in this case are in the majority but who don't control this situation.

Participant: I've had a feeling for a number of years recently in view of the civil rights movement, of which this movement you're associated with is obviously a part, that it may be possible that the teachers of the last few years have, in fact, turned out a product which is not willing to continue to accept unquestioningly the behaviors of the society, but that the actions chosen by these "products of the schools" to arrive at the ends they desire are not the courses of action which the teachers, representing the older establishment, would have chosen. Therefore the kids alienate themselves from the teachers, and as a result we get the attitude expressed by Mr. Chambers of hatred for all that is represented, when in fact the very people who were being hated were the ones that initiated the attitude which was developing action which now backfired. Is there any basis at all for this kind of thing as you see it?

Mr. Drake: Well, I'd like to hope so, but I just know that the teachers, by and large, in our school happen to be fairly parochial in their thinking, because many of them are descendants of the local grower and that whole establishment themselves. And maybe we haven't had the cross-fertilization we needed, but right now our school board wouldn't hire anybody unless they pretty well worked them over. They have been pretty careful about who they put their hands on; but maybe that happens someplace else.

Participant: I think it's possible it may happen even in your valley that teachers are willing to teach children attitudes which result in things which we may not be willing to stand up and bear the brunt of but, nevertheless, are responsible for in an indirect way.

Participant: What you're saying is true, but of how many, of what percentage? Just as you can have a safe little movement if it's true for one per cent of the population or two per cent, those of us who don't live or work anywhere near Berkeley can look at what happened there in '64 and say, "Oh, that's great. We need more of that." What you're saying is true, but it's true for a very small minority. I think even among farm laborers we're still dealing with minorities, not with the majority of the population. Am I right or am I wrong?

Mr. Drake: Well, among the kids it's a majority way of thinking. In other words, the child of the fertilizer dealer, for some reason, I don't know why, tends to identify more with the kids whose parents are out on the picket line than they do with the growers' kids. I don't know what it is. So the majority thinking in the school is for the revolution that is taking place.

Participant: What we have to develop, it seems to me, are strategies to allow this to occur so that you don't get this opposing resistant force which could bring a confrontation that could be disastrous.

Mr. Drake: It seems to me that our whole school system has the general concept in mind that somehow these kids are going to get good middle class jobs when it's all over with, and doesn't take seriously the fact that, in our case for instance, farm labor is a very dignified labor. School teachers say, "God, I hope I can get this kid so he can become something else and get out of that rut." Well, why in the hell get out of that rut? Why not help the kid's father and stand with him in trying to make a dignified profession of it? What's undignified about tilling the soil? We set up universities like Davis to develop machines; education is working toward the goal of developing machines so that when these people down here begin to organize and want money for what they're doing, this university is going to develop a machine to go down and take that job so it can do it cheaper. That sounds like I'm against mechanization. I'm not. What I'm saying is that that's the kind of mentality our university system develops, that somehow we've got to not change the cultural situation which people are striving to survive in down here, but we've got to be more mechanized and more professional in everything we do. More unhuman.

Participant: But does not the parent encourage the child to get out of this system, get a better job than he's had, a better lot than he's had in his life through education? So you're fighting two ends of it because you've destroyed the pride that that farmer has -- he no longer has a pride in it because he knows he's going to have to get re-educated in another profession sooner or later. Either that or go on welfare.

Mr. Drake: When the farm worker organizes, he says, "There's no reason why this job can't have as much respect as the plumbers' job"; then he says, "I'm going to build up seniority on this ranch." He starts talking about building up seniority within his job, and then he talks about giving his kids the opportunity to make a choice of what they want to do; but he doesn't say, "Son, you've got to stay in school in order to get out of this rut that we're in," because now there's the hope that this rut they're in is going to be a respected job -- respected by the father, therefore respected by the son.

Participant: We shouldn't of course, be aiming at what people are going to be so far as jobs are concerned, but what they're going to be so far as people are concerned; that's what you've been saying too. A teacher is to some extent a tool of the organization that does the hiring. And every one of us has felt these pressures and every one of us, I suspect, has subversively undermined the power structure in doing just exactly what you've said in trying in ways that we think will help children be somewhat less submissive than we are.

Participant: The twenty-one year old who goes out into the classroom has got to have backing from the people above him in the school systems to help them learn these things. It takes years to learn how to deal with young people in ways to support them when they want to move against the stream. What can there be in the training program, whether in terms of internships or wider experiences away from the narrow parochialisms of our own past, that gives us an opportunity to seek different things, gives us an opportunity to be activists, and at the same time to find ways of producing social change that are going to be effective for many years?

Mr. Drake: It seems to me that everything has to be done by the staff of the university, by the professors of the university, to put young prospective teachers in touch with these people who are being organized. You know we've never had one university class of prospective teachers, whatever you call them, come to Delano to find out what the strike is all about.

Participant: I think the problem that you have presented is very complex. I don't think organization as such is the answer either, because we see in New York City a situation where the organized union teachers are in effect resisting change. The schools have not taken the job of trying to revise society. So what you're fighting is a historical tradition that's very very difficult.

Mr. Drake: I would really organize for the right to be completely neutral. That would be a beautiful position for a teacher, so that you could bring Cesar Chavez and one of the growers on the board into your school, and say to the kids, "Here they are; take your choice." But you see, the school system won't allow you to do that because the grower would say, "I'm the only one that has the right to speak here because I'm on the board. This is my school." So I'm asking for neutrality.

Participant: In this particular area that Jim speaks of in California, you have a lot of kids coming through the valley who speak Spanish, who are bilingual. The teacher has a problem relating to the child. I think the university participants could keep this in mind; if by any means you're training anybody to teach in an area where you have another language, then train that teacher to be bilingual, because you can't begin to relate to the kids, to reach them, to give them an assignment, to help them, unless you speak their language. The Spanish-Americans come from a different culture. I've learned that they are sensitive and you have to be careful what you say. It's an insult if you mispronounce their name.

Mr. Drake: Any sort of an organization or any sort of a power structure that can get things accomplished has to have some sort of backing. If teachers go out and teach daily and can communicate with the kids and with the parents, then comes the backing for the power structure or the organization. But there are too many teachers who do not speak Spanish that are in a bilingual area. Anybody that teaches in Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, should be able to speak Spanish, or they're not communicating with the kids or the parents.

Participant: It seems to me that the problem of the individual elementary classroom teacher is identification with the children he is teaching. They're also individuals in the community. And they do things as members of this community outside of the classroom, such as walking a picket line because custodial workers in the public schools are not being paid enough. Or it might be that they belong to a teachers' union, and simply the fact that the children whose fathers belong to a labor union knew from reading the newspapers that their teachers belong to a union. I helped to organize a teachers' union in New Jersey in the late 1930's, and I had the experience of seeing it operate as a small group but a very effective group. Then I participated as a college teacher in Maryland in a public school teachers' union, which again was a small group. But the point is that the teachers' union, although it was a small group, was working for the things that the other labor unions were working for in the schools. And therefore they were identified with the organizations to which the children's parents belonged. And that, I think, was the basis of their strength.

Participant: You mean we can still become a power structure, a bureaucracy, that then loses contact with the masses.

Mr. Drake: If you had five guys in Delano who formed themselves into a local, whatever they want to call themselves, and they took positions and stood together in this, and were willing to go to court for their rights rather than just lie down and fall down dead every time anything comes up, they would change the whole school structure in Delano. So I'm not talking about the union, I'm not talking about a bureaucracy; I'm talking about five or ten guys sticking together right there at the grass roots.

Participant: Well, I think our basic problem is we still don't know enough about how to educate children who come from homes that do not have middle class values.

Participant: Well, I think we had a dramatic example in what Mr. Chambers was saying and the fact that a lot of people in the audience didn't hear him or didn't communicate with what he was saying. And that's not only a bilingual problem but a cultural problem as well, that for many of us as white middle class people simply cannot hear what Mr. Chambers and others who speak English were saying. First of all, you've got to learn what the other man is saying.

Participant: You've also got to know what you want. If you want something that he does not want, then you can learn all the tricks of the trade, and so what?

Participant: But at this point, I can't even perceive what he wants because I don't know his language, what he's saying. I think that I and perhaps others have to learn this.

Participant: But what do you want? I'm not saying what does he want; what do you want? This is the other side of the question. I've been very much involved in bilingual education for Mexican and other non-English speaking kids, and what's the purpose of it? Some of the communities are starting great techniques to teach the kids their own language. Well, that used to work well. But why would they want to do this? One school system calls it "for better assimilation." That's the reason they're having a bilingual program. At least they're open about their purpose. Now, do the people in the community want that? It so happens that in that community they agree with the school system and everybody's happy with it. But when you work with people who are saying on the contrary, "We want to establish an identity of our own. We don't want to assimilate. We've been assimilated and that's been wrong. Now we want to establish our own identity," before you simultaneously try to understand the other guy, you've got to know what you're after too.

Participant: But if we're going to educate to their needs, we have to go back to their culture -- where are they going in that culture?

Participant: But their needs as they see them or as we see them?

Participant: Right. We need to try to see them as they see them.

Participant: You're assuming that the teacher then has to be appreciative of the cultural background of the students. In order to do this, then all the students must have the same cultural background; which means what? Segregation. Because if we're going to get the kids all there so that we can have one teacher identify with all the kids, we can't have different types of kids.

Participant: This is the simplification route we're taking; we're oversimplifying it, and there's danger here too.

Participant: I think the education structure has been shaken to its roots, because up until two years ago our goal was to assimilate all cultural groups in the melting pot. We did very well with the children of the immigrants from Europe. Now we suddenly discover that we've failed with the children from Negro parents and Spanish-speaking parents.

Participant: We don't know how to help them develop within their own culture: I think this is our dilemma.

Participant: In the past, the children of the immigrants from Europe were discouraged by their own parents from using the native language of the parents. They were going to become Americans and the schools were able to help them learn English, to help them and even help the parents. The parents went to school too to learn the American ways. But we don't know yet how to help children who don't want to become middle class Americans, who want to be part of their own culture.

Participant: Well, here's a pretty good example, it seems to me, of one of the things that we're not doing well in our educational institution. Chambers was a pretty well integrated person within himself, despite all of the strong feelings he had. I don't think there was a person this morning listening to him but was deeply impressed with the way in which he could express himself, the way in a dialogue, when he wasn't prepared, he could still come back at that gentleman with that outburst, and do it in a way I thought was admirable. He's got very good emotional control; if what he's exemplifying has any value in it, it seems to be telling us, "Let's try to help people be real people." We shouldn't be so afraid to take these positions and place ourselves in jeopardy out of which we'll grow, because there'll be those around us who will admire our example and help us. We won't go down for the third time. And I know from the San Francisco Chronicle that Dick Foster was under deep fire earlier this spring. What we heard was just a small sampling, I think, of what he probably really did experience. Now we have excellent examples today of the kind of thing that we must be doing.

Participant: This morning I heard Dick Foster talking to somebody after he had spoken in the meeting and he said, "I said this to my teachers: 'I get a higher salary not because I'm smarter than you but because I'm in a position where I am expendable, and I'm going out anytime that I fight the status quo too much.'" If the teacher is going to fight the status quo, the teacher is also going to have to take that kind of position that he was taking -- that I am expendable in this community and I'll do my job and then get out. Now this is an attitude that we need to give consideration, because we also have the opposing attitude, that a teacher needs to be a strong part of a community and stay there. I don't think these are necessarily opposed, but they are two sides of the question. How many of us have the strength to do this? Can we help others to do it when we don't? What are ways that we can do it? This is the big problem: where is the teacher going to stand in relation to the power structure, and is he expendable in any one situation?

Participant: Well, we're all going to be expendable until we get rid of the notion that's it's honorable to have to compete with one another for our daily bread. I think this is one thing that both Mr. Drake and Mr. Chambers have been talking about, that the middle class has been perpetrating this; this is the status quo -- competition for your daily bread and having no time to allow yourself to develop as a human being, to see what human beings can do and what we are.

Mr. Drake: Could I just raise a question? I wonder if anybody agrees with a position I hear more and more from the new left, from the Columbia students; Rudd, the head of SDS at Columbia, wrote, I thought, a really excellent essay. He's saying that our university system has traditionally been that mechanism which prepares the future rulers of the world, the continual colonialists, and that our whole school system, then, is designed to scrape off all those people who don't make good colonialists. If they're not smart enough to be colonialists, you make them the army which the colonialists move. You draft them and you make infantrymen out of them. That's a gross oversimplification, which I think the new left kids are notorious for. But there's a very basic fact there. If you look at the people who get shed off in the process of getting into the universities and then what the universities do with the people that they get their hands on and the places where the universities get their money -- the huge grants from IBM and from different foundations, or in California, Davis gets money from the Giannini Foundation for the purpose of finding ways of being more professional and more careful in our ways of producing the most out of raw materials and how you manage the people who produce things -- that's a real indictment of our system. And maybe we can't even talk about education, can't even begin to discuss all these problems, if that is the basis of education -- preparation of those people who are going to become part of the state department and part of the CIA and the whole colonialist structure that we've developed around the world.

Now if that is true, and it seems to me very easy to argue it is, then none of this discussion is relevant, unless we decide to make a political change in things and new coalitions and basic changes. Otherwise, pity the poor teacher who doesn't believe in that system and who wants to bring this black child into a situation where he has all the chances that anybody else has. But our overall system is built in order to go out and murder black people and to get us involved as the policemen of the world. Now if that's true, than all of you become irrelevant because you're banging your head against the wall. So either we have to decide whether or not we're going to go along with the system or whether teachers are going to stand with that new coalition of kids and black people and Mexican-Americans and farm workers or whoever they are and say, "The system's bad and we got to change it."

Participant: There's another thing that I see in a new light from what we've been saying here today, and that's this matter of teacher organization. Maybe the reason that we can't stand very well is that we're not organized.

Participant: The individual has to be strong in his own right before we can have a strong organization, because the organization's no good if it's made up of just a group of weak, spineless creatures.

* * *

Mr. Drake: It seems to me that a lot of things that are going on in education are similar to things that have gone on in the church; the church has gone through a real agony recently, both Protestant and Catholic faiths. As social issues develop, they try to answer just the question you're raising now -- "What'll we do?" Not everybody, of course, agrees what to do and really we're developing two churches as we're developing almost two of everything -- two labor movements, two churches. Maybe that's the most fruitful thing that can happen to, if I can call it that, the education movement. And that's what's wrong with education -- it hasn't become a movement. The winds of social change in this country are movement oriented; they're kind of a mass-based interest moving in a certain direction that runs into another mass-based movement going the other way; and out of the conflict and tension comes a real discussion. That's what black people have done, they've really pressed, they've made us take issues seriously. So maybe this is completely out of keeping with this conference, but why do we always have to talk about education within the school board system, within the public education system? Maybe there really needs to be a movement for private education where there's a lot of experimentation, and get away from public grants. I'm convinced that the way that the last four years our administration has tried to control poor people is with public money, and it would make sense to me that that's the way they would control the direction and the spontaneity of education -- with public money and maybe with Tri-University projects where you come together and talk about rather than really getting a movement started.

This is kind of a deadly way to get a movement started, coming to the Nicollet Hotel. And why is it we can come here? Well, I presume that there's some federal money someplace that's paying for my hotel room, and as long as that's happening I know that the poor people aren't getting organized that way. The really movement-oriented people aren't accepting Federal money. So maybe it's an impossibility within the system of public education.

Participant: There is a group in California and in various Western states that are really crying out; these are the Mexican-Americans. Now stepping out to help has been your group. What do you propose that we do?

Mr. Drake: I'll try to relate it to education as much as possible. I think the philosophy that Cesar has infused most Mexican-Americans with who have taken seriously their future and what they can do to change, is that nobody, but nobody, is going to help the Mexican-American. The educator is not going to help the Mexican-American, the church is not going to help the Mexican-American, the government and welfare is not going to help the Mexican-American -- I should say farm worker, because it's very multiracial. Instead, Cesar said very specifically that help is needed and help is welcomed, but it's not going to come until you define your own goals and say, "Education isn't important to us at this time," or "Welfare is not important to us anymore." You sluff off all those things and you say, "But what is important to us is that we build an organization that is going to put more money into our pockets so that we don't need welfare and so our kids can go to school. That's pretty basic, you know; why talk about education if your kids can't go to school? If you've got to have your kids working in the field, then it becomes pretty ridiculous to talk about taking education to the fields and all those programs to labor camps. As long as people have to live in labor camps, there's not going to be a real solution to their education problems. So this is literally the first time in three years since the movement has surfaced, and certainly the first time in the six years since it's been in the process of being organized, that there's been any consideration given to the problems the educators have in relating to farm workers and the problems farm workers have in relating to educators, because the basic problem still has to be settled, and that's food and bread. That's why I was saying yesterday that it seemed tragic that our school systems won't allow educators to get down to where the people are, because in our school system in Delano if the principals wanted to really understand what was going on in this movement to get bread they're so controlled by the local political structure that they would just be replaced.

Now in the process of getting bread, in the process of organizing, all kinds of things develop; the first thing that developed could be seen in our relationship with Robert Kennedy, political awareness and political power. When you start talking about political power you then can begin talking about changing the education system, and maybe doing some things on behalf of the teachers so that they can be free. This is hard coming from me, because I'm neither a farm worker nor Mexican-American, but Cesar does not buy the line that there have to be Mexican-American teachers, or that brown is good, or that black is good. We just couldn't do that because this is a farm workers' movement; it's not a brown movement or a black movement, it's a community movement; it's community-wide, and in farm worker communities you have people from all kinds of backgrounds. It's precisely this splitting up of groups that the growers have used to keep farm workers poor, pitting white people against brown people, brown people against black people in the fields. So if I can summarize then, I think Cesar's attitude is we got to take care of first things first, and bread comes first for the laboring man. Then when his kids have some freedom we can talk about how they're going to spend that freedom and the kinds of education they could get and the kinds of education they should help provide for other people, too.

And then, the second thing is we can talk about political power, and when you talk about political power, you talk about eventual freedom from wage slavery. Farm workers can never really be wealthy because we have a system of food production that prohibits a farm worker from getting the same wage as a plumber. And I don't think the solution ultimately lies in trying to get out of wage slavery into wage freedom, but rather lies in ownership of property -- and there we really talk about a revolution. And that's a revolution that needs to affect small white farmers and non-farm owners. These people are getting wiped out. And finally, there's just not going to be any solution to urban problems until those problems are settled, because the urban poor are ex-rural poor. If you try to do something in East Los Angeles to help the Mexican-American with the War on Poverty, you're not going to do anything because it's like trying to get water to boil and pouring in cold water all the time. The cold water is the people coming from the rural areas who are being replaced by people coming from Mexico; it's just a constant turnover. So you've got to settle the base, and the base is wages right now; eventually I think the base is going to be land, but that's a long way off.

Participant: It seems to me that several of your points do bear on how we can become involved as effective forces, as educators, so we don't talk about it but become actually involved in it -- particularly political power. It's been my observation that teachers by and large have tended to shy away from any kind of political involvement at all; and we're seeing, I think, a change in direction with respect to this. I wondered if in the San Joaquin Valley you're seeing signs of the teachers becoming more politically aware and astute and forceful.

Mr. Drake: The only time I see teachers getting politically astute is when they start asking for their own rights. That's the only time anybody gets politically astute, when they start wanting to be free. My father was a teacher, my sister is a teacher -- it runs in the family -- and I've never felt like I grew up in such an enslaved family. I used to dread when my father would come home at three o'clock in the afternoon, because I would have to hear about his trying to get along with the principal and why he couldn't cut the hair of a little boy in class -- a migrant kid who had bugs in his hair -- because the school board didn't really want him in class and was just tolerating his presence; we had a segregated school in California and my father always had the segregated classes. Every time he'd speak out we'd have to move to another school; that seems like the worst kind of slavery. It's the same thing that happens when a farm worker decides he's not going to take it anymore and he gets up from under the vine and he goes out and stands on the picket line: in ten minutes he becomes a man. The same thing for a teacher; when he takes a position, when he stands up and says, "I'm going to be a man and I think this is wrong and maybe I've got some other friends who think this is wrong," he becomes a man very fast; then he becomes political.

Participant: The school board is composed of members that are growers; they have the orchards and they are dictating what should be followed. And you're dealing with a transient population. Pick any town that you have, whether it be Delano or any place -- people come through, they're there for two or three months and they move on. Now there is a criticism against the fact that this school board is composed of members of the growers, and this is thrown out; it's said this is wrong because they don't see the problems and they can't meet the needs. What would you suggest instead?

Mr. Drake: I have a lot of idealistic solutions, but pragmatically I don't see any solutions, short of someone really helping poor people in that community get organized. I'm sure in other states, Oregon probably, and Washington, you really do have a much larger migrant population; we have a settling population. Our big problem is that we have a population of non-citizens, to a large extent, and the result is you have to start at a very basic level, with citizenship classes. But that can be done. It sounds like an awful hard way to get people registered to vote, if they have to first become citizens, but in the city of Delano we now control six precincts, and those six precincts can control the city if they want to. They're the most populated six out of sixteen, and we control them one hundred per cent. In other words, your farm workers are members and they can change the politics of the community. Now I'm just going to tell you a trade secret; we don't want the politics of Delano changed right now because we need good opposition, and the mayor of Delano is perfect for our need. But Kennedy carried those six precincts, and he carried the city. And in any primary we can get our man in. We usually have about eleven people running for city council for three positions, so it's easy to get a majority now; and we could take the city council, we could take the school board. But that's after six years of work. Take the community you're in and work very, very quietly; in every community you'll find the people that are going to live there year round, people who can lead this and who understand what's going on. Maybe it's only three people, but work very, very quietly for two or three years. It doesn't have to be a project that's got a massive federal grant, it can happen very quietly. We're finding little co-ops springing up all over the West Coast; there are a couple up in Washington now; in Watoma, Wisconsin, there's activity going on; it's going on in Ohio, it's going on all over. We're plugged into almost every state now and we have people in every state and we want to know where the action is, who's interested.

Participant: What do you mean, adult education? Or are you working toward your children's education?

Mr. Drake: Right now we don't need either, because the adults are working in the fields and they're always going to work in the fields and the children are working in the fields and they're always going to be working in the fields until the adults can make a real living out of working in the fields. So right now, that kind of education, no. What I'm talking about is political organization, that type of education.

Participant: You can't have citizenship classes without some minimal reading and writing ability for each of those people. This is our problem, as educators.

Mr. Drake: But I don't think you'll find a Mexican-American who doesn't write in Spanish.

Participant: So, what you'd want would be political classes in Spanish, then? They don't speak English very well.

Mr. Drake: It's not classes. Forget the whole thing about classes; just get classes out of your mind. First of all you've got to find the people in the community who are just interested in changing things.

Participant: Now, would these people be the farm workers or would they be other citizens, clerks in stores, bankers?

Mr. Drake: No, I'm saying poor people in your community.

Participant: But not the farm workers?

Mr. Drake: They may be farm workers, but what I'm saying is that if we're going to talk about changing political structure, it's going to change the structure of your school board. You're going to find the people who are enslaved and who want freedom, and they're not going to be the merchants.

Participant: But I want to see what we as educators are going to be able to do.

Participant: Well, there may not be farmers in your situation, but there will be poor people in the same kind of economic situation that the farmer has.

Mr. Drake: You have to say, "I want to be at your mercy and you determine what it is you need to get out of this situation and you tell me what can I do; how can I be at your mercy?" And get out of the whole paternalistic business that education presumes, teaching children and having a relationship of a father to a child. That's the kind of image it strikes in my mind. I don't think that's a bad relationship, but when it comes to people in the community, they have to be the professors, they have to be the educators, they have to tell you, and you have to make yourself available to them. And like you say, it helps to be able to speak the language. But even that's not crucial, because we can communicate the fact that we are truly concerned human beings, concerned about their problems, without necessarily doing it in English or Spanish. I'm trying to change an attitude rather than saying, "This is what has to be done in terms of education." And maybe they decide that they want to stretch the dollar and want to form a co-op; that's a good place to start working together, to begin trusting one another. We started the Farm Workers Association with a credit union. People who travel around and don't see each other too much and then begin to settle down into a community need to have the experience of trusting one another and handling each other's money. That really builds trust in a hurry, if you trust somebody with your money. Maybe that's what you need to start in your community.

We're talking about organization and involving new people in organization; the key to effective organization is that you use your main liability as your chief asset. Our biggest liability is really mobility -- the workers move all the time. But that's also the chief asset, because that means the growers don't know who their own workers are. And if you really want to confuse some growers, just change their work force three or four times a week and see what happens to their production.

Now what's the chief liability of a white middle class person who wants to be a servant to other people? Well, it's his whiteness, his middle classness; it's his incommunicativeness, his inability to talk to people. Well, that should be your chief asset then: to say, "Look, I don't know what your problems are; I'm at your mercy; tell me what we can do together," and then to be prepared to take the answers and grow with them. I started in 1963 organizing for the union in the city of Porterville, which is about thirty-five miles from Delano. I spoke very little Spanish and I had only one contact; I got a list of about eight farm workers that that person knew. I had to drive around the block about eighteen times before I got the courage to get out of my car and to knock on the door of the first person. I knocked on the door, and I really picked a doozy: they didn't speak any English. But they had a daughter who did, and I said, "I'm working with Cesar Chavez; I want to see if we can't get something started here in Porterville, it doesn't necessarily have to be a union movement, it doesn't have to be anything, but would you be willing to come to a meeting and we'll discuss there what's necessary for Porterville and what the workers here need, as a place to start." And they in turn got about ten of their friends that they worked with in the fields, and we had a house meeting in their yard. Out of that meeting of ten people we got about seven more meetings.

After about fifteen house meetings, we finally got around to about thirty per cent of the farm worker community in that city. When we first got together, we just spent the whole evening talking about nothing, really, there were so many problems: welfare, education, how to take what money you got and make it last, the fact that they were getting cheated under the minimum wage law on the sugar beet thinning. We just talked about all these things and they formed themselves into a loose organization. We came back another week and wanted to get into more specific things and they decided, finally, the first thing they would do: they would co-operatively buy a five hundred gallon gas tank and they would buy gas at wholesale, just like all the growers do, and they would sell it at a one cent increase. So the first thing you knew, we had people coming and getting involved just because of that old beat-up gas tank.

Then we moved from that into a wage dispute in which thirty workers were being cheated on this minimum wage thing: we got an attorney to represent them, we won the cases, and we had a union. Then after a while they voted that they wanted to merge with the N. F. W. A.; and there was a lot of conflict and tension over whether or not they were giving up their freedom. Here was a group that three months earlier didn't even exist, and they were fighting over whether or not they wanted to give up the freedom of being an independent group to merge with this massive Delano organization which had been in effect for two years. They really became eloquent about their rights, but they finally did join. That Porterville group marched to Sacramento, they had a rent strike at the Woodville Labor Camp, they've done all kinds of things that have revolutionized that county. But it all starts by just saying, "Look, I want to be of use, and I want to be helpful." If school teachers would take that attitude in going into the community and say, "I've got your son in school, why don't we talk about some of the problems you've got in your community," before very long they're going to start talking about Cesar Chavez and about their problems, and maybe you can fade out of it, and it can go on its own. If it becomes too hot, if you decide you want to fight something in the education system and they're organized, then you can get involved in that.

[At this point, Mr. Drake leaves for another meeting.]

Participant: I started my teaching career, as most of us did, feeling strongly against teacher's unions of any sort; that has mitigated over the years. I don't belong to one except the NEA, but I really wonder if we make a mistake in not being better organized. I wonder if I need to be more alive to this kind of thing and if I could be more effective working in that way.

Participant: I think an important point that he made awhile ago was that when he went into Porterville he didn't go in and say, "Now I'm going to organize you." It was on a person-to-person basis. He went to one home to talk to one group of people; he said, "I am at your mercy; I am your servant; what do you need and how can I help?" And I don't think the importance is in the union itself and in belonging to the union; it's the relationship with the people. And the union may be an instrument for that.

Participant: Right now your teacher groups are wanting to change towards new things in the school. The way they go about this is to say to the people "All right, you people in the community, we'll get a couple of you that go along with it, and then we'll bulldoze the rest of you into going along with it because we happen to have your children so you better agree with us." And some of these changes aren't taken as a part of community action; it's segregated just to the teachers. The schools, being a federal function right from the beginning of this country, have never fully taken into consideration the community.

Participant: We're talking about teachers getting the kind of freedom to do what he is talking about; I'm looking at my situation in my own school district, where doing something different from what the board of education dictates is just impossible at this point. We've had a very nice professional organization for years, and they serve great tea and the cookies are always tasty, but that's as far as it's gone. So I think that we're talking about two separate things: we're talking about unions, and we're talking about teacher freedom to get the involvement that the people here at the conference have been talking about.

Participant: But somebody else is not going to give the teachers that freedom. They've got to get it for themselves.

Participant: I'd like to offer a challenge to you that Mr. Chambers gave to me. I found him a very charming man, talking to him on a one-to-one relationship. I said, "What do you think will happen as a result of this conference?" He said, "Nothing." And I said, "How can you say that?" He said, "Well, what will happen is this: you'll get some immediate stimulation from this experience. You'll have good feelings and it will make you feel as though you are going out to be some kind of pioneer. When you get back, the forces that you've been resisting are so big and engulfing, they'll swallow you up and then this charge that you've momentarily built up to do something about it will dissipate." And I think he's put the problem right where it should be. Somehow we have to develop within us a kind of commitment that will not be turned away or shunted aside from the very issues mentioned.

Appalachia: Zi Graves and Sue Easterling

The problems discussed by Jim Drake and those which Zi Graves and Sue Easterling discuss are similar. What is said by way of introducing Mr. Drake's remarks could also be said to introduce the remarks which follow. But whereas Drake speaks of a wealthy area that uses education to control people and to prevent their securing the dignity and self-control which they seek, Graves and Easterling speak of a ruined region and a defeated people. One notices even in the remarks of Graves and Easterling a kind of eddying between despair -- "Nobody can beat 'the system' and few are trying" -- and hope -- "Come over and help us and together teachers, poor people, college kids, and kids can change the kind of teaching which is done and so the view of the world of the next generation." The discussions of this section obviously would give EPDA departments some mandate to do something about the state of the education professions in Appalachia.

Recently, Time magazine, in writing of conservative student revolts at Pikeville College in the region where Easterling and Graves live and work, characterized it as suffering from exactly the same problems and suffering with exactly the same sort of leadership which Graves and Easterling appear to be wrestling with. Students at Pikeville are rebelling against being asked to confront the issues of poverty, abuse of national resources, company exploitation and so forth. When one understands that the grey pages of Time say the same thing concerning the social conscience in Appalachia as Graves and Easterling (who describe themselves as regarded as "radical" and as "troublemakers" in their own region), then one sees their sense of confronting absolute indifference in a supposedly "responsible" social structure as a little more plausible.

Miss Sue Easterling
Pikeville, Kentucky

I'm not used to talking to professionals, although I'm a professional, because they're not worth talking to. I spend most of my time talking to poor white mountain people and unfortunately, most of them happen to be women. We have a sad case as far as our mountain men go, our brave, strong mountain men. Most of them have got silicosis, arthritis, have lost a leg, have lost an arm, or they died in the coal mines many years ago. Their children are still living.

Education in the mountains is very bad development. Our history is one of people who were thieves, criminals, bonded slaves, who came over to this country and ran away into the mountains -- a very strong, independent people who lived there many years in isolation until the northerners came in and exploited our great resources and took away all of our riches, just like they have done to all the other minority groups. The only thing that they say in our favor is that we're white. That's interesting. I haven't been able to cope with it because I'm still poor. The only reason I got an education was because I was bright. My brothers and sisters didn't get an education. And they're causing problems in Chicago because they have to work in factories and they're still hungry and they ain't used to them rats. They're also causing problems other places. There are white ghettos all over, and they're going to be worse.

In Kentucky where I live the education system is dominated completely by our local power structure. Janitors' jobs are very highly valued. You're in the upper crust if you're a janitor; you're in the upper crust if you cook; and you're in the aristocracy if you're a teacher. You want to keep this position because this is where you're from and this is where you stay. And so you just say exactly what the guy in the courthouse tells you to say. You don't do anything else. And you perpetuate the vast conservatism in our area that supports a man like George Wallace.

You talk about culture; we don't even *have* a culture, because we're supposed to be part of the mass white society in our country. Who are we? We're very, very poor. Pike County is the richest county in eastern Kentucky and fifty-seven per cent of the people are below poverty level. Most of the counties average about seventy-eight per cent. How can we get out of this? What is education going to do for us? It never did anything for me. I went through the whole gamut: I went to a one-room school; I went to a high school; I went to a college -- all in eastern Kentucky. And I still can't get a job, because I'm a little bit militant.

We started a school much like the Rough Rock School. We had a Boy Scout troop that were working on cars, learning about mechanics.

We had a local mechanic that was teaching guys about cars -- every guy in Appalachia loves cars, and I don't care what, they have a wreck of a car that they can work on. The poverty program supported us; we had ladies who learned how to sew and learning how to re-do old clothing and so forth. And we did have a citizenship class that taught people how the county politicians were supposed to work. We had one lady in our hollow that had a mental problem and every so often she had to go in to Lexington, which is very far away, for treatment. And her family has been working very hard to get enough money for her to go in to Lexington every so often. They're very, very poor -- her husband has no hands -- and they didn't know it was the duty of the county sheriff to get her to and from this hospital until they found it out in the books.

We were kicked out of three buildings; our buildings have been shot up; we've been red-baited. We have to deal with this type of stuff. And it's the same old democratic type of education that you all keep telling me about. Doing exactly what you all told me to do in those schools, I just get kicked, and so do a lot of other people. We can't deal with it, because it's a vicious cycle of poverty that nobody's going to let us get out of. And we can't even organize; if we do, people get picked off; because they're white, they get picked off and they get told, "You can take a janitor's job over here. Leave those guys alone. They're dangerous, they're communists, you don't want anything to do with them." And it's really hard to work with. It's hard to contend with.

One thing that I think you all can do is to use the influence that you have over universities or colleges or whatever you want to call them. The universities in our area perpetuate the status quo in our area and conservative ideas about education and whatever. The intelligent people who want to stay in the area, who want to make a living, go to colleges and stay -- well exist -- for four years, get a degree, and come back and teach, because we have an economic problem and that's the major way you can stay there. It's a beautiful country. If, while they were in college, they got indoctrinated with different theories and ideas, they might get the Holy Ghost and start feeling it in just a little bit different way than what the county superintendent and county judge have been telling them. They might feel a little bit stronger and they might be able to come back and teach our people some of the good things about what being a citizen really is and what being an American really can be.

I don't know who it was, but some economist way back in 1947 said that there's no need for there being any poor people in our United States. Then why do we still have twenty million poor people? And before long it's going to be thirty million and forty million, and it's going to create a greater and greater problem. I guess it's yours. But I'll do the best I can with what I can.

Mr. Griffiths: I'd like to make one comment, particularly because I'm from New York City. One of the biggest problems in the city, is this fight over what's called decentralization: It most certainly isn't decentralization: it's the demand of the local communities to control their own schools. We've just had two excellent descriptions of what happens in some places when the community does control its own schools. And I just want you to think about that, as I've certainly been thinking about it. There are just as many lousy schools in this country that are community controlled as there are good schools that are community controlled. The mere mechanics of community control is not sufficient to provide excellent education, and in many places it's the worst deterrent to good education that could possible be construed. And so I think that what we need to do, rather than getting hung up on these slogans, is really to attempt to consider the kind of educational system that we want in this country and the kind of mechanism that it will take to get it and to stop arguing about slogans that really, in the long run, have a zero correlation with any degree of educational success.

Mrs. Zi Graves

Bloss, Kentucky

Mrs. Zi Graves
Bloss, Kentucky

I am Zi Graves from Rock Castle County, Kentucky, in the Appalachia area that we've all read so much about, heard so much about, and seen publicized. But I'm sure many of you do not know the truth of Appalachia, especially of the education in the Appalachian area of the eastern part of Kentucky. This to me is a problem; it is the problem. I'm sure all of you think that your problem is the greatest; so do I. I am an uneducated person. I moved to Appalachia thirty years ago with half of a high school education. I was presumptuous enough two years ago to take a test at Eastern Kentucky for a G.E.D. and I got it. Since then, I've been working.

I've been fighting for education for thirty years, because when we moved to Kentucky, I had a tiny baby. I was out of Ohio, and I believed in education. My husband believed in it. But we moved into a rural section where there was no roads. We had one little tiny one-room school about two miles from our house. I had hopes of sending my child to a better school. I wanted my children to have some advantages. We dreamingly thought that by the time she was in school, we would have a large consolidated school. So we started fighting for it. When she started school, she walked two miles to a one-room school with a teacher that had been there for fifteen years who believed in the rod and the long switch and for extra punishment, ride the child on his foot. That embarrassed the child. This is what my child started out with. You're wondering what 'riding them on the foot' is? Crossing your knees and putting the child in front of all the other children and bobbing him up and down and saying "Trit trot horsey" to the whole group. Maybe a fifteen year old boy in the fifth grade that was still going on -- this was his punishment. This is the type of school my child started to.

We started begging for education. We started bugging the superintendents. We moved to Ohio. We had another child. We worked through the war. They got a start in Ohio; my little girl was in the fourth grade when she came back to Kentucky. One-room school again. My son was in second grade. They had a start, they had a marvelous head start. They could read. They could pick up any funny book and read it. They were already getting into literature books. They were pretty good mathematicians. So when they came back to the one-room school, they were isolated. They didn't fit in. They were outsiders because they knew more than the children around there.

So we continued our fight. Let's get better schools. Let's get consolidation. They went through this period through the eighth grade. Then came high school years. We had no high school. We had no roads to get to a high school. The closest high school was in another county. So we trucked our kids out over a dirt road three miles, morning and night, took time off from farming to take our children to a bus line to bus them fourteen miles into another county so they could go to school.

Then the real battle started. Our superintendent was supposed to pay tuition for them because she wasn't furnishing education. She promised tuition. We didn't get the tuition at first. So we was batted between two superintendents of two different counties. We wasted days and days and hours of driving thirty-five to fifty miles to each town. "What are you going to do about my child? If its tuition isn't paid, it gets out." Four years my daughter went through. She graduated as valedictorian, and five of the highest honors in the whole school was given to Judy. But just before she graduated, the superintendent of this school sent us word she did not get her diploma until her tuition was paid up. My God, we thought it was paid. So we bounced back on our superintendent. Another three years of this until we got our son through high school. Thank God, they went to college. She's a psychologist. He's a captain in the Air Force. A victory.

We fought superintendents for seven long years, being battled and batted. At the same time we were trying to get other children in our community to go to high school. We were encouraging it. We found out later that these kids dropped out. About two years ago I was talking to one of the parents and she said, "We couldn't afford their tuition." I said, "My God, what tuition?" We never did pay it. We fought it out. We were determined the education system was going to come across and give our children what they deserved, what was theirs by rights. But the other kids in the community, we found out, had been cheated out of high school because their parents didn't know how to fight. Someway or other, we got a little fighting ingrained in us, and went on until they was through college.

Then our youngest child came along, nine years younger, and we started the battle all over again. Now where do we go? By that time we had fought the road departments in this state and got a road. Thank God; we was off of the dirt road. But the school superintendent was still there in her power saying, literally, "Those kids'll never go to school. Why do they need a bus?" Every time we would go to her, we would get this answer back: "A bus won't do any good. Those kids won't go to school." We said, "Try it." One of our neighbor girls and I went up one day and we fought the school system one whole morning. "Try us. Give us a bus. Let's get these kids off of the roads."

They were dropouts at ten, eleven, and twelve years old. They were dropouts running the roads. "Give us a bus. Let us prove ourselves." Then we pulled one little string that she didn't like. We said, "If you don't, we'll go to the county judge." Here is your power structure. Here's your tool. The superintendent of schools has the county judge under their thumb, and vice versa. They work together. "We'll go to him and demand indictments against the parents for letting their twelve-year-old girls run the roads, because there is a law they're supposed to be in school." So she kind of backtracked and said, "Okay, give us two weeks."

You know what? Ever since then, we've had at least one high school child graduate from our community. At least one a year ever since we demanded that a bus come down into our rural community. This was a community that was 'not fit to go to school,' that was 'not worthwhile.' I have three kids that are through college since we were told that it wasn't worthwhile to send a bus down.

It is worthwhile, people. The children in Appalachia, their future is in the educators' hands; and my God, until they can realize the future of these children, what you put out into Appalachia, what you put into the ghettos, that is our pride. That's all we have. We have nothing but our children. We are poor people. We live in the mountains. We love the mountains, and live in the mountains. Our children is the only thing we have. 'They've' got everything else; 'they' have our coal, 'they' have our minerals. And 'they' aren't taking our kids. We need those children educated. We need to show them a better way of life.

I'm not demanding them to be taught a different culture. No, I want them to retain their culture. Let them play their guitars, let them play their banjos. Give them their culture, but give them a chance to choose if they want a better life. If a boy wants to be a captain in the Air Force, give him something to back him up so he can be a captain, so he doesn't have to go on the ground crew. If a girl wants to be a psychologist, my God, let her be a psychologist. They're needed. Whatever they are, those Appalachian children are there. We have treasures in 'them there hills' of Kentucky. No one knows it better than I.

I didn't like Kentucky but I'm beginning to kind of love it because I see there's a battle there that we all have to fight. You educators are the ones to bring it to us more forcefully. You can help us to fight the battle. There is only one of me in the county that is really and truly fighting for this. There's others say, "I want to see it happen but we've been downtrodden so long, we're afraid." When you go to the superintendent's office and she turns you off and says she doesn't want to deal with you, when she says she doesn't want Head Start in the county because she has to work with poor people on the board (this was her answer), we had no Head Start. And they won't allow us to have an O.E.O. because we are awakening the people to the fact that there are better things in life.

When people like me are denied the privilege of going inside the one-room school I have fought to keep my children in because 'I was going to destroy their books,' it was because I was awakening the people to the fact that a PTA might cause a better school system. Our PTA wanted to form. They wouldn't let us form because 'there was no need for it.' It would rock the boat a little bit. So the superintendent says, "No PTA. We don't have time for it. We have other things to do."

These are the pities of Appalachia; and it isn't only Rock Castle County. Children have to walk two miles out to go to school and then not get a hot lunch. There are hot lunch programs in some of the schools, but not every school in Appalachia has a hot lunch. Pity the child that goes all day long in school with nothing under his belly except maybe a little cornbread for breakfast because he doesn't have a hot lunch. The hot lunch program doesn't reach him. Some of them have the hot lunch program if they have a quarter to pay for their dinner. Are there any of you families could take ten kids and feed them and give a quarter a lunch for all ten kids to keep them in school on $225.00 a month plus the food and the clothes they have to have? It's nearly impossible. So a lot of the kids just go without their lunch. They wait until they get home and they have cornbread and soup beans. And it's pretty darn good. Those kids are thriving on it. They get their proteins. They might not get all their minerals but they get their proteins. And they're thriving. And they're coming out of the mountains and filling up your ghettos. They're filling your factories with valued help. The factories realize the value of Appalachia. When our boys go into Cincinnati they get jobs. They're not turned down. Those people know those kids can learn. They learn fast.

I'd like to tell you a little incident that happened to me back during the war. I was working in a factory and one fellow from Massachusetts, a very fine educated engineer, kept coming to my machine all the time and talking about the 'dirty Kentuckians.' I finally kind of got fed up, so I told him one day a little thing that was pretty close to me. I had been raised in Ohio, went to school in Ohio, was from a big family, and I didn't rub noses with too many high school graduates at that time because we all realize back then, there wasn't as many. My college acquaintances were very, very scarce in Ohio. I went back to Kentucky and first thing I ran into was teachers. My husband's family is full of teachers. I ran into high school graduates, college graduates, teacher's degrees, started rubbing noses with them. So I told him, "That's funny, you know. I'm from Kentucky and most of my acquaintances are high school graduates and college graduates. We have a willing people to learn, very willing. They want to learn but they've been tied back in the hills for so many years they haven't had a chance." He said, "Aw, get off, Zi. I hear more dirty jokes here in this place from this bunch of Kentuckians than any place I've ever heard." And I said, "I told you they was willing to learn. They think that's education." "They want to learn, people. They want to be like you. Our hill people wants to be like you. If you want to tell dirty jokes to them, they can tell them back. They'll learn them. Thank you so much.

GROUP DISCUSSION

APPALACHIA

Miss Sue Easterling
Mrs. Zi Graves

GROUP DISCUSSION

Resource Persons:
Miss Sue Easterling and Mrs. Zi Graves
Appalachia Region
Chairman: Peter Hovenier

I am Zi Graves. I live in Rock Castle County, Kentucky, which is on the edge of the Appalachian area. We have very, very serious problems in Appalachia, which I'm sure all of you have read about. We're frontline news most of the time. Our school systems are back a hundred years, or even worse. I think they deteriorated instead of coming up; in fact the educators themselves are now saying that we are going backward and we need an opening, we need something. We have too much provincialism in Appalachia. The superintendent is elected by a board that she keeps under her thumb, or his thumb. They elect a board through buying them off. This might be a shock to everyone but it is true. We had a man tell in our own home at a little community meeting about a year ago -- he was apologizing to a new Board member who got elected, regardless of the buying off -- and he said, "Well, I didn't vote for you, but I got paid thirty-five dollars for my vote." Thirty-five dollars a vote for a board member, who only gets ten dollars a month -- and that's for his expenses. We don't know why the buy-off, but it is so the school system can be held under a political thumb; we are sure of this. Then the system hires the teachers of their choice, because they recommend to the Board who they want hired, which happens to be a sister, a niece, a brother, a mother, a father and it goes on and on and on. Then they get their little certificates, or they hire the ones without certificates; as long as they're in the family and they're in the political structure, they hire them. Therefore we have the same group coming up year after year after year -- no dedicated teachers.

We have a few dedicated teachers, but for most of them it is only a job, because jobs are not available in Appalachia. We don't have the industry; teaching is the big job. So if you go to some little college, whether or not it's a good accredited college, as long as you get a teaching certificate, you got it made; if you get in with this political structure, you have it made because you have a life-time job here and get a life-time teaching certificate, regardless of teaching abilities. I know one woman who's doing remedial reading -- I don't like remedial reading; I believe in teaching children from the first grade up to read, not remedial reading. She was not fit to be in the system any longer, but she had a life-time certificate. Parents objected to her teaching. She was giving remedial reading, and she has a speech defect. She doesn't even read efficiently herself, but this is her job, teaching our Appalachian children in our little one-room schools how to read better. This is ridiculous. We need this looked into. I'd like to have an invasion of good teachers to invade Appalachia and form their own 'wake-up' group. Let them form themselves into a union until they can start controlling the systems there. I would like to see the best teachers in the nation take over the one-room schools, not second-rate teachers, not those that just come in to be baby-sitters, as our superintendent told one. She said, "I don't know what to do." The superintendent said, "Baby-sit. That's all you're expected to do until you learn the trade and then we give you a better school."

This isn't right to our one-room children, because they have no culture in their background. They don't have the parents to give them enthusiasm or anything else; so they go to school and they come up against a teacher who's baby-sitting, sitting there to keep law and order in the classroom. This needs to be broken down. We need the best teachers. If we give them extra wages -- my God, pay them extra wages, give them a double salary, but put the best we have for these under-privileged children who are going to school. Maybe it's the only change they'll ever have. The little seven or eight years they'll go to this one-room school, then they'll be dropouts. This is their only contact with the outside world, so give them their chance with the best teachers we have. This is part of my problem.

Miss Sue Easterling: Professionally I am a teacher, in reality a bum, because I can't get a job teaching although I went through the whole educational gambit of Eastern Kentucky -- I went to a one-room school and then I went to an eight-room school and then to a twelve-room school; well then, I went to an Eastern Kentucky College that became a university while I was there. Being half-way intelligent, I realized six weeks after I was in college that something wasn't right, but I went through anyway because they paid my way and because I couldn't afford to go to a better school; I played the game. But because I organized underground newspapers and things like this, I can't go to another school in Eastern Kentucky. I did finish that one though, and I have a teaching certificate and a fairly good teaching record, and I have some progressive ideas and I like to teach.

I applied in my home county on the new vocational program. I'm a vocational teacher in Home Economics; that is subsidized by the government. They had a unit that was open and they couldn't get a teacher and you know I thought, "Boy, I'd be a real missionary," I really felt good, "I'll apply and help out." My family has a reputation of being community leaders, opposed to the power structure; I applied for the teaching job and my application got lost. It's really strange --

it got lost, and they had to close the unit and lost the federal money because they couldn't get a teacher. I still don't have a job and I still eat corn bread and fried potatoes, if somebody will give them to me. I could get a job in Ohio. I was asked by many people to work in Ohio. I was asked in Tennessee; I was asked in other states; anywhere in the country, I could probably get a job teaching, but I don't want to be there. Last year, being interested in education, I attended Teachers' Association in Pike County. We had a teachers' strike and I thought, "Maybe there's some really progressive teachers here who can do something." I attended several meetings and the only thing that people could talk about was, "How can we get our pay? We haven't got any pay in six weeks. Now what am I going to do? My house payment is due, my children are hungry. I can't get my pay day; when are they going to give a raise?" We have people with masters' degrees who want to live in Kentucky, who are from Kentucky and who like Eastern Kentucky because that's their home; they have masters degrees and are making forty-two-hundred dollars a year. What can you do? It's a fact. I can bring in four relatives who have degrees.

In our district if you teach, if you get a school, you buy a Chrysler from the guy who owns the Chrysler car lot because he's on the school board and he has to okay if you get a teaching job or not. You have to pull the right political pulls to get a job and you have to keep your mouth shut or you say what they want you to. I can't talk to my friends who are school-teachers about progressive education, because they're scared. How can you cope with things like that? How can you develop an education system when our people, our poor people, have never even had an education? They haven't even started. If I get involved in something like this, they tag 'em communist. Our people don't even know what a communist is. It's just a bogeyman.

I worked in summer projects with twelfth-grade people who couldn't even read. We can't even start on your level because the teachers are highly, highly conservative; they advocate George Wallace in the classrooms, and talk about what a great American he is. We can't get past the problem of black people in our community. Black people never hit the mountains until the 1840's when the railroad came, and the only reason that there's prejudice against the black people is because the other class tells that they're lower than us. And we can't get out of our situation -- I can't get a job and become upper class in my community because I won't play the game of the power structure. So just because I'm white doesn't mean that I can get up.

The only way I can get up is if I go to the ghetto -- my sisters in fact, are in the ghettoes in Chicago; working in factories. They and their husbands are living in rat-infested buildings. The same thing in

Baltimore, Washington, and all those places, as all the people from our area do is go up there and create more problems because they don't know how to adjust to the city. There's nothing taught them in their educational system, so that they'd even know what a street was, what it meant to go to a department store.

They don't even know how to go to a supermarket or how to budget money or how to do any of the things that normal everyday working-class people do. They don't even know how to come up to that level. All they do is create problems, social problems mostly.

The other day I talked to a man in a private school about a teaching job. He was a social worker and he needs a teacher really bad in a special education partnership with ten kids who have emotional problems. He said, "I have two teachers' aides who are taking care of the situation now, and we're getting ready to have a meeting; I want for you to sit in." So there were two ladies, very protective, maternalistic-type ladies -- very concerned with the Christian spirit and love and brotherhood and all this type of stuff. The only thing they could do was just hold on to those kids and make sure the kids got to eat and went to bed and that the kids felt some sort of connection with these mother-images. One of the girls said, "Well, he was bad, so I give him extra homework." It's like giving a kid half a gallon of ice cream, just because he liked ice cream or something. You don't spoil a kid with something by punishing him. You don't get him interested in that. And these kids had especially deep problems.

Now the attitude these teachers had is an example of the whole attitude of teachers all over the area. Just drill them with stuff; homework is just something to get through. Now my brother is a very intelligent guy, very mechanically inclined, and God, the kid's ruined; he's sixteen years old and he can't go anywhere. I don't even know how to cope with the situation because there's nothing I can do for him in that area. He's in the high school and he's ruined.

Participant: I feel kind of puzzled, because you both present a very negative picture of a hopeless cycle that's just going to perpetuate itself.

Mrs. Graves: It is.

Participant: But at the same time you must feel there's some way to change, because you wouldn't be here if you didn't feel there was some way to change it, some way to modify it, some way to improve it.

Participant: You were talking about teachers, I take it. Note the teachers are human; we're all human. We all come from these backgrounds. Isn't it only natural that you reflect in your adult years what you've grown up with? I take it you're asking how we change these attitudes. How do we select people to do this? Is that part of our work here at the Conference and in the whole year?

Participant: I'd like to interject just one comment. I think there's something else here. I went through a one-teacher school in East Tennessee and came up through this same sort of mill. I'd say that when you do change teaching behavior and become a more effective teacher in terms of the external standards of the role of the school, you're going to get into trouble. Suppose you study George Washington; you ask, "What does Washington mean to a white American?" and you could very easily go on to ask, "What does he mean to a Negro American?" Both would be valid questions. The second you do this, the more effective you are, and the more likely to get in trouble. The only thing you can hope for is publicity so someone will come in and save you.

Miss Easterling: You're right. The Council of the Southern Mountains, an organization that has been in existence for fifty-five years, has what they call a 'talent bank'; also I worked with an organization that caused a lot of problems, the Appalachian Volunteers. Now we got many, many interested professional people who wanted to come in as teacher; they could not get hired because they presented a threat to the structure that already existed there, because the superintendents know they're not competent educators or competent administrators. The teachers know that they're inferior, but they don't know how to deal with it; they don't know to accept it and work from that point. All they can worry about is: "How am I going to get my pay check?" They've got a good reason. I don't blame them. They've got to get past those barriers. We got to get paid.

Mrs. Graves: We had a boy come in from Harvard with his masters' degree in secondary education. He also belonged to the Appalachian Volunteers at one time, but he resigned and was applying for a teaching job in another county. Our officials happened to be there, and saw the application being filled out. They said, "Gosh, this is prestige. Harvard! This is prestige. We have to have him in our county."

So they hired Little John and brought him down and put him in our local one-room school. Well he was dedicated; he was marvelous. He come in with his open ideas; he started letting the kids learn on their own levels; he started bringing experiments to them. The administrators didn't like this, so they immediately wanted to consolidate our one-room school into a two-room system. Well, finally, he went along with it and consented to accept the job, if he could help these children go into a different environment, a different situation. So he talked with the superintendent over some plans of his -- the way to get them to break into a new situation. She said, "We are not paying you to teach up here; we are paying you to baby-sit. We do the thinking. You don't think." This boy had marvelous ideas, and she told him outright that he was not to think; she did the thinking. So John resigned. But he is teaching in another location in Eastern Kentucky and doing a marvelous job in a little one-room school, with his own ideas.

Miss Easterling: He's lucky, because most of them can't get positions.

Participant: Have you found ways at all to break through this power structure, which is the first and foremost thing? I understand everything is controlled at the local level, and I expect it's just as controlled at the state level, too. Are there communities that have somehow broken through this? Are you organizing? Your story is not too unlike some of the things that are happening in the big urban center like New York City, where they're trying ways to break the power structure too. It's just a different setting.

Mrs. Graves: I attended a national PTA conference in Chicago last fall, and we came up with some marvelous ideas for PTA's. So I went back home and started working with our local group. We had fifteen parents wanting to form a PTA. We finally went to the superintendent and she said, "Why, of course you can form a PTA. Why of course you can." She had previously denied us forming one, but when we went back as a body, she said of course we could, if the teacher would. By the time we got to the teacher the teacher had her orders to not let us have a PTA, so she come back with, "I don't have time to fool with the parents." So how can you break it? This is what we're against.

Participant: Can our professional organizations -- the NEA, the local organizations, the state organizations -- can these be effective elements in breaking this power structure? Within the nucleus of the organization can it be done?

Miss Easterling: The people who are heads of those organizations generate the conservatism that we're trying to fight.

Participant: This is what I wanted to bring out. If we can break into the power structure of the organization, do we have the capability then of changing ways of thinking? It seems like a possible approach by simply infiltrating like the FBI does everything nowadays.

Participant: I think part of the problem, as I hear you people speak, is that the teachers are quite content. Many of them are. And they do not want to break out because they have relatives who are part of the power structure. We're talking to parents and community people, who would like to see a change.

Miss Easterling: The teachers won't even communicate with community people because they're aristocracy. The only way we can talk to them is when we say, "We'll support you to get better pay," because they are very badly paid and they realize that. That's the only way that we can get them to work with us. And then in the end, they won't; they'll turn tail and work against us. Now we've done a great deal in organizing people and tried things like 'sit-ins', 'work-ins', all this stuff with one-room schools and innovations, summer projects and all this type of stuff. Then this becomes a threat to the power structure and they try red-baiting and arresting people and harassing people. That's the thing which we, as organizers, have got to fight. I see what you all can do is in terms of the schools, like the universities in Kentucky, the junior colleges, the extension colleges and things like that. This is where those teachers go to school and this is where they get this indoctrination about the old conservative ideal about education and stuff. When I went to school, God, all those theories I got thrown at me, I couldn't even deal with now, because I know that they're not important; but the people I went to school with are using them in schools and they're teaching them.

Participant: There was a conservative element in the school I came from, but when I went into a school system, I found many, many dissatisfied teachers. They realized the inequalities; they realized the imbalance. But the power structure is such that there is absolutely nothing the teacher can do about it, because the administrative element controls the professional organizations and the instant they step out of line, even as a small group, those teachers have a way of just disappearing. The next year they're not back.

Participant: I think we have to face the problem; I think we tend to play games with ourselves. I think we have to recognize first that what is going on in the school is in large measure what a significant portion of the community wants. We seem to think that it's just a part. It is not. I grew up in the South and what we've got to recognize is what a large part of the community wants. Number two: we have got to recognize that what we are talking about is a change in behavior patterns of children, who are in turn going to fight, or going to change the community structure, and we have got to recognize that the community, the whole social community -- and that is parents, that is the power structure, that is even those who don't have in large measure -- are going to fight it like any kind of social structure does. They're going to fight it bitterly; they're going to fight it brutally; they're going to fight it with everything they've got. And when we go in to change these kinds of things and go in to try and create or help children build new life-patterns of dealing with their community, we are taking on a lot. We've got to recognize we can't pretend that it's just the power structure or it's just a few. It is the community! And we don't want to change, because it's too difficult. We say, "For crying out loud. Why are we having trouble with the gentleman with the beard, Mr. Chambers?" The reason we have trouble with him is that if we understand him, that means we have got to change. If we believe him, that means we have got to move; but we're just not quite willing to move.

Participant: I don't think we sent teachers out with an armor of integrity; if it becomes a matter of either losing themselves or losing their jobs, they prefer to lose themselves; they throw themselves away. Let's face it, until we're willing to put ourselves in a line, if we're always going to stop just that little smidgeon short enough so we don't quite lose the job, forget it. You've got to be on the line. And if your job goes, look some place else.

Miss Easterling: Some of the things you're all forgetting too -- you may be talking about your place, but where I live things are different. The whole history of the mountain man is different. He was the thief that came over from Europe and ran away; he was the bonded slave, and he ran away into the mountains because he was white and he could do that. His whole history is of a very independent and very strong and very illiterate man. They have had an education system, but for a very short period of time.

Participant: And a significant portion of them still don't want an education system.

Miss Easterling: No, I think that you're wrong. I think the controlling factor in our area of the concept about education comes from the power structure. I know this for a fact. And people are willing to fall in line with the man that's got the money. They'll listen to anything as long as you got a dollar bill waving in front of their face. I'm an activist in colleges, and I don't care if the students riot, I don't care what they do, just as long as those mountain children, mountain kids, college kids will start thinking about what's happening around them. I do it on my own with some other people. But the college that I live at now is the only school that I know of which, last year when all the rioting was going on, had a big demonstration because the administration was being too liberal. This was a Presbyterian college where the Presbyterians are coming out with some really groovy stuff. They decided, "Well, this is one of the problems in Appalachia. We've got to get some really good teachers out." So they brought in all this new young creative faculty. They said, "Now okay, let's just don't deal with all this crap. Let's get rid of dormitory hours and let's start building up a library and let the kids stay in the library all night if they want to." The kids just went stark raving mad; they couldn't deal with it.

Participant: I've a question to ask then; if the power structure's so all-controlling as you both indicated it is, you two are both mirages. No one like you should exist in your area.

Mrs. Graves: We almost don't exist.

Participant: There are ways to exist in the classroom.

Miss Easterling: You can't get in the classroom, damn it! I have a bunch of little friends who I can spend time with on the weekends, and we can look through a microscope and talk about the racial issue and talk about -- hell, I haven't heard about Biafra since I been back in the States; nobody talks about the problem of Biafra. Nobody really can say anything about Vietnam or Czechoslovakia because they won't even talk about real issues; all they do is say that they listen to the news. I can talk to kids about that, but that's only on my personal level with him. I cannot get into the schoolrooms; I have friends who are teachers, and they cannot get in the schoolrooms.

Participant: Let me ask three questions: I think they relate. Let's say I'm teaching a class in the social sciences at the college level. What can I do in that class that's not being done, in terms of the person who will eventually be teaching, that will make some difference? Secondly, I'm teaching a methods class, preparing someone to teach at a given level. What can I do in that class that's not being done to make a difference? Third, I'm a member of a national association. What is that national association not doing that could be done? Are my questions clear enough?

Miss Easterling: Last year, when I was in school, I worked with three professors who were great. The editors of the underground paper and these professors worked together on various issues. And these professors did in their classes exactly what they thought was necessary: they let down all the conservative barriers; one of them even grew a beard, of all things. They taught in classes, and talked about racial issues. One of them was a journalist; he talked about the journalistic problems in our country and the free press. One of them was in literature, and he talked about Lenny Bruce and those people, and went into the sociological aspect. They were fired. But I know at least seven students who were enlightened -- hell, you ain't going to knock them down. And they're going to produce seven more students. And that's what produces a revolution. And it has to be done in the colleges; it has to come from the colleges, because those are where the most intelligent people go. Our kids go to those colleges because they want to stay in the mountains and that's the only way they can get a job -- going to college, getting an education and coming back to teach. It's the only way they can stay in the mountains, and they want to. They're dedicated to the mountains. And if they are touched when they're in college by the ideal of free thinking and growing and developing, then they would generate some influence when they get back.

Mrs. Graves: What we need in Appalachia is a better training system in the local areas, the colleges themselves, because they do feed back into Appalachia their own students, primarily. Colleges in Appalachia, like Berea, Eastern Kentucky, Morehead, and the extension colleges in Somerset, are the training points that are feeding the teachers back into the area. We'll take it like this then; they are educating their own group of youngsters. They need to be educating on a different level to go back and change things, instead of going in the old, set rut they've always been in. So all they are interested in, as a rule -- I'm saying the majority, not all of them -- is to get that little piece of paper that comes automatically with going through a certain curriculum and the old set way. They get that little piece of paper, they go out and do a little practice teaching, then they come back and live at home and drop into the same old rut. "This is a kid that I know his ways of life, so I won't study that kid, he has no chance anyway." This has been pointed up quite clearly. It was pointed out by a principal of a school in Pulaski County, Kentucky about two weeks ago. She was talking to me about the deficiencies of children. And I'll use her words, she said, "You know this little kid over here he's 8 or 9 years old. He's a bastard, and he comes from a bad background and you know we can't teach him a thing. He's headed for the pen anyways, because his foreparents were. So we're just going to get him through." This is a principal of a school, of a growing school. We need this whole trend of thought changed. And the change is going to have to come through our local institutions of learning. It seems to me that this thought is going to have to be changed; that this is going to have to come and I don't know how we can get these dyed-in-the-wool principals and superintendents out of the system. We explained yesterday what the system is; how you get into it and how you hold it. So how can we get them out? But it's going to have to be a change. Now, the thought came to me this morning, we're all yelling change, I'm yelling change; what am I doing about it? I'm yelling for all of you to change it.

Participant: With all due respect, I think you're far too optimistic about education. You're putting your eggs in the education basket. Put it all in the university -- you're saying exactly what I want to hear. This is where I work; I want to go your line of thinking. But I don't think that this is really where the decisions are made and where the things that count lie.

Participant: If we're willing to put ourselves on the line, I think it's a place where things can happen. I'm agreeing with you, I don't think they are. But it's a place where things can.

Participant: What the college can do is present people with possibilities. You can't say that we see that something needs a change, therefore we've got to make a miraculous sea-change and the person who sees things as all green now has to see them as all purple. You can't expect that. We can't force the kids to choose something that's new, but we can make them aware of the fact that there are other possibilities. There is a possibility for change, and we just have to trust in human nature that they may possibly try something which is slightly different than they were aware of before.

Participant: It may be more expensive to sell your job.

Miss Easterling: Well, one little thing that could change that would really change the whole thing, is the concept of social welfare. In the mountains social welfare is really a disgrace. Now most of the students that those people are teaching are on some kind of social welfare. If they have this kind of concept, that these are degenerate, low, really nothing people, how can they really teach them efficiently? Eventually we have to develop a new social welfare system in this country. How can this evolve, and how can our part of the country ever be a part of this change, if there isn't some sort of growth along this part of it, that people have a human right towards certain needs like the right to eat, the right to have something to wear, a place to sleep, to be warm? And from that point, if they get past that, then they can grow as human beings. But they have that right. But where I live, people don't even believe that people have that right; if they don't get out and grub for it, and get out and beg for it, then they don't have that right. If education can teach people that these are humans and they have needs -- just that basic little thing, that these are people with needs -- then they'll start looking at their students as human beings.

Mrs. Graves: Someone asked about the national organizations being able to do something. I attended the NEA meeting last fall in Washington; it was a special meeting on problems like this, and I think that it was I who presented one possible solution: to have a conference where poor people -- I mean the people from the hollows -- would attend the conference and tell the educators of America in the NEA the problems, the personal, little, tiny problems -- how my little Johnny was treated, how my little Mary dropped out of school and things like this. And I think they're supposed to have a conference in November of this year which will be on this level. These people will have their expenses paid so they can attend it; otherwise, they couldn't go. As she says, a lot of them are on welfare; but if they get a chance they will go. It was termed pretty aptly as being a 'shock treatment' to the educators, because we know the educators do not know what is going on in our one-room schools. They do not know the philosophy that is being taught out there. And if these parents go and tell them on an open stand exactly what's happened to my little Mary and my little Johnny, it may awaken some people. Now this is the answer to one of them. This can happen.

Participant: But if your parents are so dead to the possibility of education changing, how will you get them to go to this conference?

Mrs. Graves: They're not that dead. Really. No, they are not that dead. They believe in education. There is one man I've been working with for a couple of years; he has fourteen kids. A great family, just a marvelous family. I've got him involved in crafts. He is seeing that each child of his goes through high school. He says, "You'll go through until you grow a long white beard as long as you stay in my house, because you're getting an education. I don't have it; I only went to the second grade. But you're getting it." We have these kind of people, but they don't know how to break the barrier down.

Participant: Then you have generated interest.

Miss Easterling: The people have the interest, but the people are scared and they have no power.

Mrs. Graves: They haven't learned to break through it yet.

Participant: How do you get a different superintendent in? I mean where is the voter? Nothing's going to happen until you get the superintendents out that are now in the power structure.

Miss Easterling: We did a lot of organizing in our county, a lot of real political organizing. We have five school board members; we vote for three of them, which would make a majority. We had the power then. So the school board had this really big meeting and asked the superintendent to resign. That was four years ago, and he's still there. Legally nobody knows how to get him out; he has a ten year contract. We have to face it constantly, and it's really funny; because people have shot through our window, we still get phone calls -- I got one just before I left home; you know, "You dirty communist" and all these obscene ones. I've learned a lot of cuss words over the phone that I never learned before. We go through that whole gamut.

Participant: I want to pursue my point just a little further, and clarify it, at least. I think what you've said spells out much more clearly what I was getting at. In my opinion there's a marked hesitancy on the part of the academics to get their noses rubbed in the dirt. And they stop at the very point that you pointed out: we show you the options, and that's where it stops. They will not do the kind of thing you're talking about.

Miss Easterling: They don't even show us the options.

Participant: Well, obviously, that's an obligation that goes with the academic life. But it has to go further than that. There has to be a commitment and action on the part of these people.

Miss Easterling: Well, I'll deal with that after you start showing us the options; that's my next spot.

Participant: The academics and the scholars and the teachers and the professional organizations as well -- the NEA especially -- have not, as you well know, been a particularly militant power. They don't pull the particular political thing that you're talking about.

Miss Easterling: You're right. You're exactly right; except you're ten years ahead of what our problem is now. It's just building a base.

Participant: Part of our problem in college is that we are not willing to put ourselves on the line in the college. We are not willing to get in there, and fight, and yell, and scream, and raise hell to get courses, to get opportunities, to get programs, to get kids into school who need to be there, all these things. And so, until we are willing to put ourselves on the line, we are unable to do more than verbalize about the options; and let's face it -- verbalization is most of the education game.

Participant: We ourselves have to be aware of the action we can take within our options, rather than to say it's the power structure or it's the academic group. For me to feel that there are other educators who have the same feelings that I do kind of gives me the guts to go one more little step beyond what I've ever done before. Perhaps you as a community leader would feel something of the same identification; that you would have support, not necessarily from your community but from the academic world or the professional world or whatever, to give you the encouragement to make one more push. We have to focus on the things that will make a permanent change, but at the same time we have to be aware of our individual commitment that we ourselves in our area can do "just one thing more."

Miss Easterling: That's the best cop-out I've heard in a long time because you have left all those people back there in the things you talk about. Education, you all can go on ahead of us, and that's groovy and great; but you're still leaving some really bad problems behind that have to be solved first, as far as I'm concerned with my ordeal. There is not that few people in the world who are facing that problem. There are 20 million Americans who are poor. You know you're leaving 20 million people behind; and, boy, they're really productive people. And before long it's going to be 40 million of us, and it's going to get to be a bigger, bigger problem. We've got the other problems, the social worker, our housing, all those problems, but education and social welfare work together.

Participant: In other words, you say that you've reached a point of diminishing returns and you no longer can use this evolutionary process. It's going to be, we're going to have to have some type of revolutionary process.

Mrs. Graves: Put more into the college teaching of the teachers. I think that's the primary cause of this meeting anyway. You know you professors don't have a very good recommendation back of you, really. This is pitiful; I keep hearing this now from kids who've gone to college. They look down on the professors; they say, "They don't give us anything. If you can't do anything else, if you find out you have no talent, then you teach; you go up there and that stupid prof will shove you through some way or another." This is a response from college kids, and I've been associating with college kids now, through the work I've been doing, from all over the United States. I didn't like it, because I want good teachers and I keep my ear tuned into why, so the professors don't have a very good picture in the academic world.

Participant: Let me ask a question. Are the colleges involved with the public schools in Kentucky? Do they work with the teachers, or are they involved in any kind of activities?

Miss Easterling: The Poverty Program put in a lot of money for teacher training programs, and they have audio-visual aids. In one county I worked in they had this great big old trailer full of all these beautiful audio-visual aids materials. I was the only person in the whole country who knew how to work it, and they wouldn't let me touch it, because I was a visitor. The Poverty Program had given them all this stuff. The teachers don't know how to use it. They go to a workshop, [1] you know, that they have in the summer for them; they're required to go sometimes because the Federal Government gives them money and the school system benefits with money for this. But they end up talking about Johnny what's-his-name who doesn't do anything in school.

---

[1] Presumably Miss Easterling is giving an example here of the kind of involvement with the public schools which colleges have sought -- i. e. a very superficial involvement in Title XI workshops or similar activities under Title I or OEO Programs.

Participant: Without a direct frontal attack on the power structure, what you people are doing and talking about is really going to create a change in the power structure, because the power structure only remains a power structure if it represents the feeling of the community. If what you're doing influences the community, these people who want to stay in power are going to have to do something to change.

Miss Easterling: But you've got two different things. Number one is the majority of our teachers aren't enlightening people at all. Plus that, we have what we call the middle class, who are the Wallace supporters. The poor people who are facing the problem are in a "minority." They don't have any control and can't get any control, because if they do, they'll lose what job they do have, or they'll lose their welfare check. In our county you have to know the right lawyer and you have to be able to come up with $50 or you don't get on welfare. How does the kid have enough guts to go home and, no matter what it does to you, say what he learned?

Mrs. Graves: Going back to the man with fourteen children at home, I was in his home not long ago and some way or another a stupid question came up of the world being round or square. And he looked at me, really in amazement, he said, "Well, Zi, you know you're too intelligent a person to believe the world is round. You know it couldn't be, the Bible says different." Now, his children know better. And his children finally will influence him to change, but if they go home tonight and say, "Well, daddy, I know it's round," they would get scolded soundly and they may get spanked and put to bed, because he's a believer in a square world. This is the kind of change I am talking about; this is the kind of education level that we are dealing with.

Miss Easterling: I think we have a unique problem in the mountains. We've seen a change from a paternalistic society to a maternalistic society, because since the coal industry went the men are unable to support their families. The women come out stronger and the men sit around. So it's a maternalistic society, and the pit children know this. And they're really mixed up about their own home life. So they don't know how to cope with that, because when they were real young their father was a big strong man and they seen him come in all black after work, and you know, they have this vivid picture of the light on his head and everything like that and the bucket and they remember how very important it was to wash that dinner bucket at night really good so he could go back to work the next day and what a really hard job he did, and he was a really big man. And now he's just a man who sits out there and doesn't do anything; can't get a job. Half the time he's really sick because you know they get silicosis, they come down with arthritis, they've lost an arm, they lost a hand, they lost a leg, they're completely paralyzed; all these kinds of things have happened to them. So you have a real problem like this with the family. The children don't know how to cope with it -- they can't understand it. These people didn't have educations. My father has a second grade education; my mother had a third grade education. Those children realize that their parents are illiterate, and they have to cope with this problem too.

Participant: You've given us some remote ideas educationally. Is there any more direct way maybe we can tie in to you people?

Mrs. Graves: Send us good qualified teachers down from the outside world to break this conventionalism.

Participant: That seems to be the problem; can they be employed?

Mrs. Graves: Yes. Our man in Frankfort who certifies the teachers knows how many counties are hiring teachers with emergency certificates. We have to hold on to applications, we have to guard them, and have photostatic copies made and sent to him, because they're destroyed, like Miss Easterling's has been. I saw this happen before. But if we can keep these straight, and send qualified teachers in to fill these emergencies of the provisional system, they'll have to hire them, and he'll see to it they're hired. He's interested also. I'm sneaky, but I'm desperate -- this is the way you can help.

Miss Easterling: In central Kentucky that might work, but up in the mountains where I live it don't work.

Mrs. Graves: Maybe you haven't contacted him.

Participant: You know you people are talking about us being on the firing line and making a commitment in the U.S. Why can't the kids make their commitment? Isn't that what's bothering us? The kids have made it, they are standing, they are making commitments, but they're being tagged ultra-left and ultra-right or anything that's way out.

Participant: And I also get the feeling that asking that our teaching be so effective that kids take a stand in their own families, we're in essence asking them to do something that we find very hard to do ourselves, and we're adults. So I think we do have to interfere in the family to a certain extent in that we have to present additional viewpoints, other than the family's innate one, to provide for the possibility of change.

Mrs. Graves: And if the teacher can give enough respect of herself to the child, if he respects and loves her enough, that child is going to be able to make his decision. It'll all come through the love of the child and the respect for the teacher, because that child will be able to very subtly catch on to her -- we've got a smart bunch of kids these days, and they can catch on very easily and they'll know if you're really giving them the love bit. And they'll be able to handle it.

Participant: And maintain a good family relationship at the same time.

Participant: They're interested in interpreting this program in many areas of the United States. If they were to have a program of this nature in the area of Kentucky you're talking about, it would seem to me that the local colleges and school systems should not be given much control over it, or they wouldn't be able to interpret the program, as you would like. Is that right?

Mrs. Graves: They should give the young people a better training. Really give them intensive training in field work. Send them out and let them study, let them have some history on Appalachian political system and what they're getting into and give them some kind of a shot -- I don't know what kind of a shot -- to give them inspiration to stick with it. Once they get in there they throw their hands up and they say, "I get more in Ohio; I have a little set job in Ohio; I get more in Michigan; California pays good wages." So they automatically leave when they see these problems, because there are problems when you come in and your superintendent says, "You should not think. You don't do the thinking; I do the thinking for you." I was wondering if we could have a seminar like this conference in the Kentucky area, the Appalachia area, and include all the presidents of the colleges. I want to get in touch with Dr. Weatherford immediately, when I go back to Berea. I'd like to get in touch with him and tell him what has happened at this meeting, and I'd like all the literature I can get on it. I'd also like to contact the president of Eastern College. I don't know him as well as I do Weatherford, but if we could get this kind of people to see what's going on and go through some of this shock treatment that you folks have evidently gone through. And it is a shock. We went through this shock years ago when we saw our children was being denied an education. We went through a shock, and we're still fighting it.

Participant: What if Tri-U got this kind of conference and brought your people in?

Miss Easterling: I think a conference of this kind would have to come through the education department, because in my experience, there are some very good professors and very good people who are interested in progressive education in Kentucky, but their hands are tied and they don't feel strong enough to work in their department to develop this type of a program.

Participant: How would it work to create something similar to the Tri-University project, and simply do it in terms of Appalachian educators who are working with the youngsters. If you brought together a representative group of educators from the various schools in that area and in effect set them to work in the situation, I think they might appear less threatening to people since they would be home-based individuals.

Participant: Conceivably one of the things that each of the projects could do in terms of its focus this year, would be to take a look at teacher-training institutions in the Appalachian region and identify strengths and weaknesses that exist, but with the purpose of designing such a program. Would this make any sense at all?

Participant: I don't think we have to go to Appalachia to look; we can look right in our own institutions. How many institutions are providing for some political orientation for teachers? None. Maybe there's a course in political science and that's it, but how many have an opportunity for people to be involved in community action? How can teachers become a part of the community when they're a little group off by themselves? What are teachers worried about? Teaching reading and that's about all. We don't have to go to Appalachia to know this; we know it now. But what are we doing? We've got the power structure to fight; but we don't even know how to deal with the political situations in our own institutions.

Participant: If we do these things, does it change your teachers or does it just scare the heck out of your teachers and make sure that they all go into all white, nice middle class neighborhood schools?

Mrs. Graves: I belong to the Appalachian Volunteers, which is a group of college students which went into the rural sections of Kentucky and renovated those schools and their tutorial programs. Part of our curriculum was to take these mountain children that had never been out, on trips to the zoo and to things like this to get them started, and then we started taking the teenagers and the pre-teenagers into colleges. We took them to Berea and had tours. I even took some of them to see The Messiah at the Berea College. Some of the kids had never seen anything at all like this. So we started, this was part of our program.

What is a teacher profile to our students? What are we doing to set an example for our students? Where are our future teachers coming from? How do they feel about you as teachers? What do they see? Do they want to be a teacher from looking at you? Do they respect you enough? Are you creating this kind of an impression on our youngsters, to make them want to go into the teaching profession? Or are we pushing them out? I find in Appalachia, a lot, our teachers are pushing our children out of the profession because they have such a hard front. And they're pushing them out of school. They're not dropouts they're pushouts. So where are we going to recruit our future teachers, our true teachers?

Participant: You represent the lower groups in your strata of society, but how satisfied are the communities in the higher social classes with their school system?

Mrs. Graves: I don't know about all the upper-stratas because they look down on me because I'm working with the lower strata, so I'm still an outcast. But I have talked to a lot of educators, I've talked to principals of the school; I've talked to teachers. And I find out there is unhappiness there as well as here. They keep saying, "Please take the power away from the superintendents, please put different power in different places, because she has too much." Now this comes from principals of schools, this comes from the teacher level. "Please, if you have word anywhere, tell them how foul our political structure is in education."

Miss Easterling: For four years I have spent my time, every so often, going to a conference like this and it hasn't done any good yet. I can't talk to educational people where I come from because only a very few of them will listen to me; but you can. And if you do, that's all I ask. I took some very valuable time to come up here: I missed several classes and a lot of programs that I should have been involved in. Now if you ain't going to do nothing, then I ain't gonna do too much more of this.

Participant: Now these conferences that you've gone to, have these all been in Kentucky?

Miss Easterling: I'm the best travelled Appalachian I know of. They even sent me to Europe.

Participant: Have these conferences made any attempt to get any type of civil program established for the Kentucky area with the Kentucky colleges? Unless that area becomes involved and these institutions are part of the decision-making process, we can't sit up here trying to decide for them.

Miss Easterling: I had been trying to see a person concerned with social welfare for a long time; I never could get to see that man until I was in Helsinki, Finland and he was at the same conference I was asked to come to.

Participant: What would happen if you could get enough of these people together who really want to do something and then a number of us down there so that we could hold a big conference where we could bring the Governor in and advise him, and a lot of these superintendents? Would the shock treatment help, could anything help? Do you have any ideas this way? I think this is what you need to think about.

Miss Easterling: I think that you have a chance to get in touch with other people who are in the educational field and to present ideals to education schools in Kentucky, but it would have to be done forcefully. That's the reason I keep talking, and Zi keeps talking, and people like us keep talking. Maybe it would be good to talk to education schools and to try the project in Kentucky.

If you want we can give you names of education professors or people who have shown some interest but haven't been able to do anything. But as far as that goes, that's all we can give. If you want contact with communities and things like that, we can do that. But as far as educators go, they are completely alienated from us.

Mrs. Graves: I'd like to tell an incident that happened. Two years ago the people got completely fed up with the way we were being treated, the way the school system was. The Appalachian Volunteers made an appointment with out Superintendent of State Education in Frankfort, and also with the Road Superintendent, to see about bad roads and bad schools, bad politics. We had the appointments made, we confirmed them and we reconfirmed them. We gathered a group of seventy poor people, I mean poor people from the hollows. Some of them drove up to three hundred miles to go to Frankfort to tell our pitiful story to the State Superintendent and bring actual incidents to his mind of the atrocities that were happening in our schools and the deplorable conditions of our one-room schools. When we got there, the road man conveniently had other plans; our appointment had been confirmed the night before. We'd been up since five o'clock driving to Frankfort. We continued with his assistant. The Superintendent of Schools sent a little notice upstairs and said, "Let me know five minutes before you come down so I'll be ready for you." So five minutes before we went down I sent the messenger down, "We'll be down in five minutes." Do you know where he was? On the elevator going upstairs while we was going down. We didn't get to see him. He left his great big A-S-S (assistant, you know) in his place.

Participant: Would it help if you were to concentrate on particularly depressed areas such as Appalachia or the ghettos of New York City, Chicago, or Newark? You could form a task force of Tri-University teachers and college people who are, at least for a year, responding to new ideas and who could give one another support, and select fifteen teachers out of Eastern Kentucky and send five to New York University, five to Nebraska University, five to Washington and two or three college professors out of each of these colleges could be sent out there, and then see what happens.

Participant: It seems to me that by bringing in the people from the community we are getting at the roots. We are listening to these people from Appalachia talk about what the needs of children are, and that is important. What is the nature of the need of the person you're going to teach? So we've got some information from Appalachia. We see that they've got certain needs and problems which ought to be considered in planning an educational program for the teachers that are going to go back down there, and also for the children. We listened to Mr. Chambers and to Mr. Dick from the Navajo reservation and we found out that these groups also have different needs which must be considered.

In order to plan an educational program for them, we need to know what *they're* like, what *they* need, what *they* really want, what *they* desire. Now that's the way we've got to proceed as we plan programs for them. You might get off the base sometimes, but we have to try to consider the society in which they're living, the persons that we have got to work with, and put all of that together and see how we can plan a program.

Participant: I think that we ought to get over the misconception that *we* are going to change something. What the Indians had to say was the case in point. Evidently the government has been trying to cram the education system down their throats. And it wasn't until the development of their own educational system that they were happy or content. *We* can't go in there in Appalachia and say *we're* going to do this and *we're* going to do that, because it won't have any effect. I think it has to stem from within the people who are mainly involved, with us acting as 'resource people' and let *them* do the telling and let us do the advising.

Chicago: The Woodlawn Organization

Anthony Gibbs and Louise Bufford

Anthony Gibbs directs the Woodlawn Educational Experiment; he is also chairman of the community committee which is advisory to the Tri-University Project and to CONPASS, the evaluation panel of the Office of Education. Since the Minneapolis conference, he has been appointed a member of the second National TTT advisory panel and has given assistance to the Office of Education staff by suggesting to it some of the ways in which the participation of the "community" would improve the education of teachers who aspire to work in cultural and socio-economic enclaves which are not the would-be teacher's own by birth and heritage. Mrs. Louise Bufford is a Woodlawn mother who has participated in programs of the Woodlawn Education Experiment workshops to give parents an opportunity to educate teachers and teachers an opportunity to educate parents. Mr. Gibbs' and Mrs. Bufford's remarks about the proper relationship between "community" and teacher -- about the ways in which the community may offer education to the teacher -- define as appropriate to the ghetto community exactly the relationship which the Rough Rock representatives define as appropriate in the Navajo schools. As an organizer, Mr. Gibbs knows -- as does Mr. Drake -- that the sense of "initiative and responsibility"[1] is created among the adults of an area (and as among students) not when "help is brought" to a group but when its communal interest is sufficiently defined so that it creates its help from whatever resources it has. He also knows that communal interest is something which a group can only define for itself.

---

[1] Cf. Edward Yeomans, Education for Initiative and Responsibility (Boston, 1967), for a picture of schools which allow for the creation of a responsible, self-directed community among students.

Mr. Anthony Gibbs
The Woodlawn Organization, Chicago

I think the only way that I can talk about where we're at right now is to talk about how bad it was before. First, I'd like to direct this to Dean Griffiths because he's a university man, head of N.Y.U. I believe it is. I happened last year to visit N.Y.U. from Chicago to look at the programs they were running in urban education, and one of the first things I told them as they took me out to the schools and I sat for four or five hours talking to all of the people involved -- and I think they were enthusiastic about the program -- but I told them the reason why the program that N.Y.U. tried the first time was going to fail was because they didn't have any community involvement in their program; because they didn't have any support by the people who had to provide support for the students.

But to go on, let me tell you about our experience in Chicago. The University of Chicago is just right next to us in Woodlawn. It's a big institution with about five billion dollars in assets or something like that. The University wrote to the Office of Education for a grant in urban education. And you have to understand Woodlawn is integrated by day and is all black at night. It used to be integrated by day. We stopped that. We used to have nothing but researchers. You look up and down the block and you see everybody with a pad. Well anyway, the University wrote to the Office of Education for another study. And we've got some friends who let us know what the University is doing, because the University tried to urban renewal us out. But we beat that. Anyway, this friend wrote to us and told us, "Did you know that the University applied for a grant in the Office of Education to run a study in urban education?" We said, "No, we didn't know that." So we wrote a letter to Washington. And we told them, "Look, we don't want no more studies on black folks. We're sick and tired of being studied. If you got anything to offer, you want to come into the community and change some things, we're willing to work along with you. But we're tired of being studied."

I think that points to why the community has to be involved. It certainly has to be involved with a university because the university has its own ends. It's got so many candidates that's got to get Ph.D.'s every year. They've got to have a study ground to get Ph.D.'s on. So I think that this is one reason why the community has got to be involved in education.

I'll go on to say that in our particular project, what happened was this: after we finally broke that situation down, the University included us in and they established what is called the Woodlawn Community Board which has seven members from T. W. O., seven members from the Chicago Public Schools, and seven members from the University. And we have power in relationship to this particular board because nothing can go that doesn't go through that board. And this board is unique to the extent that only Superintendent of Schools Redmond, can veto anything that goes on in the schools in Woodlawn. So we do have power in relationship to being able to deal with our problems as far as education is concerned; and very successfully, I should say. Mrs. Bufford is going to talk about that in a few minutes, because she was involved.

But, I think that one of the things you have to look at in relation to this thing called power is that there are lots of communities throughout this country. Integration didn't work, by the way. They finally gave up on that whole thing. And they said, "Well look, we came here, we tried bussing, and that didn't work because too much pressure came from the other side, from people who's getting bussed. They didn't want them out there." So they said, "We can't deal with that no more so we've got to stop this bussing thing." So they said, "Okay, well, let's try to satisfy the black community some kind of way." So what they did is start talking about community-oriented schools and they created these boards. When they created these boards, and they created these boards that are giving people no power, on those boards, and when they got ready to fire those six teachers, they couldn't get rid of them.[1] They showed them they really didn't have no power at all, regardless of whether the issue is the teachers should be fired or should the teachers not be fired; they created a board that was a lie.

And the thing about public education and boards of education is, who do they always put on the boards of education? The President of Chase Manhattan Bank in New York for instance, whose kids went to all the private schools that existed. But he's on the public board of education messing with other folks' kids' lives. He's concerned, I'm sure. That's why he sent his kids to private schools because he was concerned. In Chicago, we got the same thing. They put all the great chiefs of industry on the board. And how are we going to effectuate change? How are we going to support public education when a guy sits up and talks about how he made it? You know, he came over on the boat.

You should be able, unless you're blind, to recognize that I'm black. And by virtue of the fact you're looking at me you see that I'm black. Now don't be telling me about that boat and all the opportunities. And I know it's tough. And I'm not standing up here trying to get no sympathy.

---

[1] Mr. Gibbs is here speaking of the Oceanhill-Brownsville situation.

But you took lots of things from us in the "educational" process that we're trying to get back. The Navajos still have their culture and their language. We don't have ours. We're trying to get it back through black Afro-American history. People say, "Well you shouldn't be involved in that kind of thing. That wastes the time; why don't you learn about the American democracy?" We've learned about that; we lived it. We lived it. Now we want to go back and look at something else.

I say, where did we come from? What was our ancestors? Slavery systematically took it away. Anybody who came from the same area, they split them all up. They split them up so they couldn't retain their language, their culture. Because that was power right there. That's one thing that the Indians still got left. They do have a little bit of power. See, I can't stand up here and cuss you out because I only know one language. If I knew another language, I'd probably stand up here and play like I was talking to you and have the interpreter do a thing.

It's a serious problem is this thing called inner city education and how we work it in is this. We had a workshop this summer. We started off two years ago and we got the University straight as to who was going to do what, and who was going to control, and who has some power to get involved. The same thing with the board of education. The board of education almost lost its mind. And the people thought they'd almost lost their mind by getting involved in T. W. O. T. W. O. was the one who started the whole desegregation of schools program in Chicago. They thought that the board of education had lost their mind when we got a black principal at our high school. The first one. And she was one of the individuals who had stood up against Willis when he was the Superintendent of Schools and talked about how bad the schools were. And they castrated her completely, professionally. They wouldn't let her move one iota. But when they came to us, they said they were going to be nice. They done built another high school now. (The neighborhood done got all black. But there's an adjacent white community next to it and there's an adjacent white community on the other side. So what do they do? They build two new high schools. And leave one high school for Woodlawn and one high school for Hyde Park, and one high school for South Shore. Now we got an all black high school. They got a nice middle class white high school in Hyde Park, which is segregated on the basis of economics this time, because we do have some Negroes who live out in Hyde Park; it fits into their bag. And then on South Shore they got an integrated kind of situation too.) But they said, "Okay, we're going to build this new high school." But to try to satisfy us they said, "We're going to let you name the principal." And they came to us with a list, a list of people who -- if they came to the school, we were going to close it down. That's how bad they were. The kids may as well not go to school if that's got to be the principal. So we say, "Now we want a black principal named Miss Anna Kolheim." They said, "No. We die before we give you that lady. She's been the one who's been talking about the board of education for years." "That's why we want her. What do you think we want her for? Because she's going to tell the truth. She's not going to lie to the people and make them think that things are all right."

I happen to have been the director of that gang program you read about: Senator McClellan and all his thing. Most of those guys could not read to the fourth grade, but lots of them had gone through their junior year in high school -- their junior year; couldn't read fourth grade! I think the educators have had it. You've had all the time since the whole concept of public education came out to do it alone by yourself. And we're saying that we've got something to offer you. We're saying that we have some ideas too.

And I want to go on and show one other thing -- that the educator is like the doctor. The doctor does not do his job by himself. If a person gets knocked down and hit by a car in the street, the first person that gets to him is an ambulance. And he picks up the body and brings it to the hospital. And they got a whole string of people who are helping him, all this to the point where he gets to the doctor who has to finally do the operating. And if that person dies, that doctor lost a patient. But if somebody else's patient comes in that hospital and that doctor touched that person and that person dies, that doctor can be held responsible. He can be sued for malpractice.

I think that this is one of the things that the community is saying as far as education is concerned. We're going to hold somebody responsible. We're going to do like private industry does. If you're the foreman on the job and you don't produce and you keep on not producing, then they say, "You got to go, buddy." And this is what we're saying at Woodlawn. We're going to give the teachers the responsibility of the educational program. We're going to set the goals and the needs, because we know what the aspirations are. We know what's possible. We're going to let you design a program and implement it, and if you fail -- and we can see if you fail by what the end product is -- if you fail, then we're going to show you where the door is. We don't care about no union. That's the board of education's problem; they've got to deal with the union. We don't have to deal with that union, because the board of education either decides that they're going to put people in our communities who are going to produce for the betterment and the needs of kids in that neighborhood or you get out completely and then we will try to take over the schools and run them ourselves. We will then try to educate ourselves to such an extent that we have the expertise and the skills that's required for education.

But we're giving you one more chance as educators, and we say we're going to hold you responsible. We want to see the outcome in the product of the student.

And certainly the concepts of Afro-American history, the concepts of black awareness are important. And don't let nobody fool you. People are today saying, "I don't see why they ought to do that." I had a talk with a gentleman here today. We have Columbus Day in this country and it's based on one thing, that the Italians love to have that day come along because they can feel very proud. Don't nobody give a damn about Columbus that much, but the Italians care about the fact that he was an Italian. And black people have got the same kinds of people who've done the same kinds of things. Eisenhower's living because a black man invented a thing called a pacemaker. The first person to perform an open heart operation was black. But our kids don't know about that, nor do the kids in suburbia know about it.

But I say first of all, you have created the segregated schools; integration has failed. You tried bussing -- and here's where power comes in -- that the whites in the other neighborhood say, "We don't want them niggers on these blocks." And you turned around and said, "That program can't work." That's power; but everybody wants the people who ain't got no power not to get none by saying, "Power is corrupt." That's all I have to say.

Mrs. Louise Bufford

The Woodlawn Organization

Mrs. Louise Bufford
The Woodlawn Organization, Chicago

This summer I had the privilege of working with the WESP, meaning the Woodlawn Experimental School Project. We all know that the present school system has failed. I know this to be a truth because I have a daughter in the Wadsworth School. The day that she came home and sat down to read a book and read the first sentence and started to read the second, the same words that were in the first were in the second and she didn't know them, I wanted to know, "What are the teachers teaching you?"

She come home with the new math. I don't understand that. Because I could not understand what was going on, what was being taught, how it was being taught, I in myself wondered, "What good is it for the children to go to school today? They come out knowing nothing." Then I proceeded to go into the school as a parent and take a part in this particular program. First we had what we call 'the sensitivity group,' where we sat in groups and the teacher felt out the parent and the parent felt out the teacher. The teacher would say, "Well what are you doing here? I'm a professional. What is it that you can tell me? I am the educator." This is true; but I am an educator also, being a parent, for the simple reason that I am the first person that has the child from infancy up until the time he enters school. So therefore, I am an educator. No, I do not have a piece of paper that says I have ninety-nine different degrees, but in my own right I have wisdom and knowledge with understanding through and by experience of everyday life.

So as the teachers and the parents sat down they were hostile towards one another because the teachers were feeling, "You don't have a right to be up here. You are spying on me." They looked up, there were twenty parents. There had never been that many parents in the school at one time, not even with their PTA; maybe you had one or two, three or four, if they could get away. But nothing was accomplished. The things that should have been discussed, the things that we as parents and teachers should have been concerned about, were not discussed. When we got over the part of 'the sensitivity group,' and we began to break down barriers, and to relax, we both had good ideas: "Whether you wanted to recognize me as an educator or noneducator, here I am. Now what are you going to do about me? Well we know if you had a half a chance, you would throw us out." So we as parents took a firm stand. For one thing, we found out that the faculty was divided within itself. The teachers in the K-6 did not know the teachers up in the upper grade center; plus there was distrust, one was afraid of the other. So for two days the parents pulled out, walked out, and set up a workshop in a different area. While we sat in the workshops we came up with new ideas and new approaches in how to deal with the present problem that we were faced with. Now as I was sitting in the audience, the thought and the idea came to me of this, that I feel that we should come up with new ideas for more meaningful education for teachers, parents, and students. The institutions thus far have killed the creative minds of teachers and students. The ideas of teachers, parents, and students should be shared and worked out together. In Woodlawn, this has been done. I sat with teachers, we shared our ideas, we wrote proposals. The teacher would ask me, "What kind of proposal should we write. Do you have any ideas?" I said, "First we need a purpose." They said, "Well what purpose shall we have first?" I said, "Unity; for in unity there is strength."

I feel that the teacher and the parents should come together in unity, working together. When I was going to school, if the teacher sent for my parent, and my parent came to school, I was in double trouble. I could not set my parent against the teacher or the teacher against my parent, which the kids have really done to us today. Because the parents go up to the school hostile. Then the teacher is hostile. Then the kid stands in the middle and he plays this game. And then he looks at the teacher and he looks at the parents and says, "How dumb are you all? We got you where we want you -- pitted against each other." And as long as there's division within any functioning body, it will absolutely fail. We need both. I have ideas, the teachers have ideas. Why not sit down and share them? What's wrong if I have an idea, I say, "Well look, you've tried it this way, let's try this idea of mine and see how it works. We will never know whether it'll work or not if we don't try it. Let's forget about the fact that you're a professional and I'm not. Because if you really consider it, I really am a professional. Whether you like to accept it or not, this is how it is."

Then we went into what you call the freeze where the parents would be walking down the hall and meet the teachers; we would want to speak and they would give us the cold shoulder. "There's those old parents." So we had great conflict. There was a lot of misgivings, mistrust, fears, and anxiety. So finally when everybody settled down, we came together, and we began to work over the proposals. Now we had several proposals that were made up by parents and teachers together. The teachers outnumbered the parents; so the parents decided to have one vote. And then the teachers decided to have one vote. This is the only way we could find of doing it, being outnumbered. This has worked out pretty well so far. We discussed things like the physical plant, the curriculum, the in-service training, monthly progress reports, parent-teacher cooperation, and really it was a magnificent experience. At least it was for me, because I learned things that I didn't know before. And I feel that the teacher also learned from the parents.

We have so far, I believe, implemented about six proposals which we didn't have to carry to the board, which we implemented at the beginning of the school session this year. It's still very young and we're still working on it. A lot of proposals that the teachers had, the parents would take them in the parent group and go over and revise them and then send them back and they would be carried to the general assembly and then they would be approved. And this is how this has worked so far. We discussed different procedures like greeting the parents. We had a situation where a parent didn't hardly want to go to the school but when he got to the school, the clerk was very rude. In one case, we had one principal that wasn't very nice either; well, he's not there anymore. This particular principal, he declared he would not have anything to do with our community program. He didn't think it was necessary. The Wadsworth School is one school that had two administrations. So there we had conflicts; the principal in the lower grades had conflict with the principal in the upper grades because the principal in the upper grade center had seniority over him. Then you had the split in the middle between the teachers in the lower grade and the teachers in the upper grade center. Then there were teachers that had excellent ideas but they couldn't operate on them for the simple reason that the board said no. Really they were beaten before they started. So we feel the parents and the teachers must unite in one effort to come up with a quality education for all children.

One of the things we implemented was black history, a study of the coming of black freedom, and black culture. I don't know how many of you know today that the Pharaohs of Egypt were black. They were honorable men; they were rich men; they ran their own communities. They had their own industries, which were stolen from them. Their very identity was taken.

Now, we know all this. But where do we go from here? It's time we take the pencil with the eraser on it and start erasing some errors. I say errors but we really know what they are.

I don't deal with racism too much because I realize this: if you get hung up on racism, what are you talking about? I find the same spirit that works in me works in my other brother whether he's white, yellow, blue, green, or pink. So I see racism as an evil, an evil spirit that has covered the face of the earth. It carries with it, and it breeds, oppression, lust, greed and all these things. I don't know how many people have recognized this. Where did it spring from and where did it come from? It came from within us. Have you ever took introspection of yourself and really brought yourself to task and asked why do I hate a black man? He's human like I am. He has been given every right by divine law. So who are we? And what is it that would cause us to want to put our foot upon one another? For in order to keep another person down, you've got to stay down there with him. In order for me to hold Mr. Gibbs in this chair I'd have to sit on his lap and hold him there. And when I do that, consequently, I cannot move up and progress myself.

I think it's a mighty magnificent thing when people can sit down and share ideas and express themselves. I think it's a wonderful idea when a parent and teacher can meet on common ground. I feel that it's very necessary to have what we call in one proposal "parent cooperation," where a parent can come in and sit down and discuss any problem that the teacher has with Johnny and find out "why?" It has been so that if I went up to school and wanted to know what is my child's reading score, "That's private. That's locked up." But after all that's for my child. How come I can't know that? Why are you hiding this from me? If you tell me what's wrong with Johnny, then I can go home and begin to correct Johnny, once I know what his problem is. First I want to know why is he not learning? What's wrong? Why aren't we getting through to the kids? These questions I have asked myself. Why are the students, the children, rebelling against parents, teachers, and those in authority? That was my question to myself. When I faced the truth about the whole issue, I faced it right here -- in my heart. We teach our children love, dignity, respect, order, and all these things. Then I asked myself, am I giving of myself as I should? Am I really concerned about the children, not only mine, my neighbor's? Do I keep order? Am I punctual? What the kids are really saying to us is, "Practice what you teach." You tell me, "It's wrong to knock this microphone off this table." But you turn right around in my eyes and knock it off. Well if it's wrong for me to knock it off, why isn't it wrong for you to knock it off? What gives? So whatever I tell my child, I am the first one that should be willing to do what I tell him. There's no need of me asking you to do something I do not want to do. I do not want to live in poverty and I wouldn't want you to. I think every human being should be able to live in the joy and the beauty of this country.

Why is there poverty in America, and there shouldn't be? One of the richest countries of the world. I have been told that they are paying the farmers not to farm. Why? These are some of the questions that come up in my mind. But first, I go in here and search myself and if I come up with something that I don't want to face, I force my mind to look at that and say, "You are a liar. Now what about looking at the truth of the matter and correcting it." It's one thing I cannot stand if a minister is preaching and he tells me, "You don't do as I do, do as I say to," because I'd say "Good day, sir." Whatever you tell me to do or expect me to do, you be the first one to put it in practice.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION

Mr. Anthony Gibbs
Mrs. Louise Bufford
The Woodlawn Organization

GROUP DISCUSSION

Resource Persons:
Mr. Anthony Gibbs, Jr., and Mrs. Louise Bufford
The Woodlawn Organization, Chicago
Chairman: John Lorton

Mr. Anthony Gibbs: I want to say that I agree with everything that Dr. Foster said; I want to say that I agree with everything that my brother Ernie Chambers said; I want to say that we're here to talk about education, and I think that was relevant to education. It just depends upon where you want to take it.

Black people all over the country are crying out, saying, "Listen." James Baldwin said, "Nobody knows my name." He's really saying, "Nobody gives a damn about what my name is anyway. Don't nobody want to hear what I got to say." Well, black people got things to say and they got to get it off their chests. Let George Wallace do it in front of two thousand people; but when one angry black man comes in a room with a hundred and twenty-five people and says what he wants to say, people get shook up. They say, "Reverse racism; he's a trouble maker; he's a radical; he's one of them militants that's going to burn down a neighborhood." We're saying we got a stake in this whole thing and we certainly got a stake in education. Education's supposed to be the road to freedom, and because education has not been the road to freedom, black people have basically been unfree. It's your responsibility as educators in relationship to this.

Now how do you do it? That's the question. Do you sit up and write lots of books? You know, what Mr. Foster said was absolutely correct. Stay out of it, if you don't want to get involved in it because it's dirty and it's messed up. It's always been messed up. We don't use education like we use big business in this country. Big business says that if you're a foreman of a company, you're going to produce. When you don't produce and you're the foreman of a work crew, they find somebody else who's going to produce because the end product has got to come out with certain specifications. They got to meet those specifications. But in education we've given the opportunity to people for hundreds of years to go through the institution. And nobody ever evaluates this; nobody ever says that this was a product that was turned out that wasn't any good. After twelve years, it was no good. Who do you hold responsible for it? That person who did that. All those collective individuals who did it. They're still there turning out the same product. And nobody's being held responsible for it.

I think one of the things that happens is that people come into the black community and they have one attitude: that the black students do not learn. So you start off with that basic premise, "We know we're going into this culturally deprived community and we're dealing with these culturally deprived kids." Well, I don't think there's any cultural deprivation in the black community. I think it's only if you come in with the concept of white middle class standards in relationship to deprivation culturally, that the cultural deprivation exists.

I understand this group is made up of both university personnel and elementary school teachers. I want to get on the university personnel first of all because you are the ones that turn out the people who go into the schools. You've never sat up and took the guts that Mr. Foster took and said that you're going to fight the system within that university. You're going to have to worry about whether you're going to get tenure or not; you're going to have to worry about whether it's going to be assistant professor or associate professor. So you teach the right things, you pull out the right books, you tell people all the lies. And when they go out there to face that world, it's entirely different from that. When they come down in the black community and they are new teachers and they never had to rub shoulders with any black people, you sent them out there unprepared. That's just like training a soldier: we send him out to battle and he's fighting a war, like in Vietnam where the people know their country, they know the swamplands; we send him out there with the traditional means of fighting, the gallant soldier with a M-1 rifle, and we tell him, "Win." How is he going to win this war when he doesn't even understand the climate in which he's fighting? How are you going to win the war in education when you don't even understand the problems that exist in the educational field that you're sending people out to? You sit up in the university in your musty little rooms with all your books lining the walls so anybody who walks in is impressed.

I can remember the first time I went into a university. I had lots of concepts about university people. I thought that everybody who was a professor was a liberal. They are the ones that society will concern. They really don't have to get hung up in the profit motive that business has said that you got to deliver. But I didn't even understand that there was a delivery that had to come about. They sit in there and they talk education. I can never understand how you can teach education; that's been one of the mysteries to me. How can you teach people to teach, when ever since you got your Ph.D. you've been sitting up in a classroom and you been lecturing students? I see the students that are coming to the university to be teachers the same way as the student coming to kindergarten in the elementary school. There's no dropouts in kindergarten, but every year it grows; and before the time that a kid gets to the third grade he's through. You've just about defeated him.

I can remember when I went to kindergarten. I was as enthusiastic as hell. I had a nice little new briefcase. What was I going to do with a briefcase in kindergarten? But my mother had an idea she wanted to send her son off to kindergarten prepared for whatever might happen, so the briefcase was necessary. And I went in and I sat down. And I saw kids crying because their mothers were leaving them. And I say, "What are they crying for? I'm glad to be in school." My big brothers and sisters had gone on before me, and I was left behind. So the first day I got there I was enthusiastic. But it wasn't long before all that was whipped out of me. I think before I got to the third grade, I dreaded going because of what it had become. Not that I wanted to go to kindergarten and play all day; I wanted to learn and nobody was teaching. Somebody was mouthing some words, standing up in front of a desk, but there was no challenge. The students weren't turned on. And the same thing is happening today. I come from a community in Chicago; if you haven't heard of the community, you've heard of the Blackstone Rangers. An educational program failed there; that's why they have the Blackstone Rangers today.

Now I want to talk about the elementary school teachers. I've got the university people together, or said what I have to say about you. I could say much, much more but I'll leave you alone and talk to some of the elementary school teachers about some of their things. One of the things is that you come into the black community and, as was brought out in there, this identification is missing. You're an adult. You can't play kids' games. You can't be a child. You can't think like a kid. And certainly you can't think like a black kid; he come to school at the age of five years old, and some of the things that he has already seen are not going to be dealt with in your white middle class suburban communities until he's nine or ten, or maybe never in his life. It depends upon how sterile the community is. But the first thing is, read all literature. Everybody's going to read everything. I think the biggest thing is to come in and be a human being. That kid is going to check you out. He's going to know if you're for real, and he's going to know why you lie; and when he finds out what game you're playing, he's going to play the same game.

People say community participation in the school is bad. It's only bad because the kid has learned how to play the parent and the teacher off against each other. He's learned to do that job very well. You call a parent up to school and here's a teacher and here's a parent. Here's a kid in the middle. And because of the hostility that existed between the community and the school for so long, the mother comes up to school or the father comes up to school, and they've got one thing in mind, that the teacher in that school is doing something to my son or my daughter.

So they come in already fixed in their mind what they're going to do to that teacher. And the teacher who was fearful of that parent -- whose child did they have in that classroom? -- says, "Now when I send this note home, I'm going to get myself prepared the next day because I'm going to come into school angry and when I meet that parent at 8:30 in the morning, we're going to have it out." And so, what has the kid done? He knows what's happened. He's played both of those groups together. And you never get to deal with that kid's problem. It never becomes a concerted effort on the part of the teacher and the parent to say, "Look, Johnny's not doing his work," because they're hung up in trying to figure out each other and they've already decided what they're going to do. I think that one of the problems is that everybody has a failure complex. We don't believe the kids can achieve, we don't believe the parents are concerned, and we don't believe the teachers are any good. I say we need to change that whole attitude. We need to start off with the idea that the kids are smart, that the parents are concerned, and that the teachers are the best. But we don't do that. We do the reverse of it. You get "battle pay" in the ghetto now. When you decide to come in you get $15.00 extra a month to work in the ghettos.

I think the most important thing is people say, "Well the black communities don't want white people in their neighborhood anymore." They are saying that we don't want them as administrators; we don't want them as teachers. I don't think the black communities are saying that. I think the black communities are saying that we want the best. You can't come in and be black, and don't try it. You can certainly come in and be white and understand what's happened in the black community and relate that to how you're going to deal with the problems of education. But you cannot come in and be black; and every white person that comes in and tries to be black fails, because then you become a paternalistic individual. You're taking black people and you're saying, "I don't care if they're five years old or if they're thirty-five years old, they're all just nice little kids. You have to treat them like that because you know they really can't stand up and support themselves in no kind of way."

Now I'd like to give you a little background of the Woodlawn Organization, the Woodlawn Experimental Schools Project, and the concept of a community school, and what we hope to do as a result of this. The Woodlawn Organization was founded in 1961 by a group of pacifists called the Woodlawn Pacifist Alliance. They started off with concern about the deterioration of the community, both from the moral point of view, from the physical point of view, and from the services that the city generally is supposed to provide the community. Grants were offered to the Woodlawn Pacifist Alliance. Twenty-seven thousand dollars was raised actively in the community by the people themselves. They called in David Saul Alinsky, community organizer for the I. A. L. This was the first time in Alinsky's life that he had tried to tackle the problem of organizing a black community. All the sociologists and everyone else said it couldn't be done, because black people are apathetic. All they want is for somebody to sit down and do something for them, they don't ever want to get involved; there's no such thing as physical participation in a black community in a meaningful way. The biggest issue going in '61 was the fact that the University of Chicago, which traditionally had been a racist institution itself to maintain the status quo, wanted to urban renew the community. It's right adjacent to the University. They had been successful in doing this at Hyde Park, which is the renowned integrated community of this country. (Well that's jive in itself because it's probably one of the most segregated communities in the country. They got some black folks living next to some white folks, but basically if you want to take the whole community of Hyde Park it's rather segregated.)

How do you beat an institution like the University of Chicago and the Mayor of the city of Chicago? Richard J. Daley was the mayor then; he's a powerful man. He was lined up with the University because the University represents stability, they represent power -- look at all the great men who run the institutions in Chicago who have graduated from that University and sit on that Board of Trustees. So it's nothing to wipe out a black community. They have done it with the Lake Meadows Complex and they were destined to do it at Woodlawn. What Woodlawn did was call in a professional organizer, who was a graduate of the University of Chicago. How did David Alinsky get accepted in the black community, being a graduate of the University of Chicago? Because the University of Chicago made one fatal mistake. The University of Chicago came out and attacked him. They called him a racist, a communist, and a whole lot of other things. David Alinsky got his credentials because the black community figured that if the University felt that bad about him, and the mayor felt that bad about him, he couldn't be all that bad. So Alinsky was able to begin to organize the community, organize them around the issue of urban renewal, building block clubs, church groups, welfare unions, whatever you can build, because people function from their own self interest. Nobody's motivated by the philosophical concept of democracy; they're motivated by: "Why can't they get my street cleaned?" You've got middle class blacks like you've got middle class whites, and they're concerned about just their street; but that's the basis on which you can get them to understand what the real problems are as far as their community is concerned.

Lots of people who live in Woodlawn had been displaced by New York Life Insurance, who built Lake Meadows. So the confrontation came. The confrontation came to the extent that the University was not going to capitulate and the mayor was backing them one hundred per cent. So how do you do that? We had demonstrations against the University;

we attacked everybody over there as a racist. We began to develop the kind of power through organization that was necessary; without power, you cannot sit down to negotiate because you're not equal when you sit at the table. You sit and hope that any crumbs that fall off, you might be able to get some of them. But when you sit down with power, you can negotiate because each person has to respect each other on the basis of that power, not on the basis of respect. You don't respect me standing up here because I'm talking to you. It's only because I can bring something to you which you think you can take and use that we've got a mutuality of respect.

After the demonstrations against the city and against the University we came up with some ideas on how to do this. One of the things that we know the mayor is vitally concerned about in Chicago is politics and votes. So one Saturday we organized a voter registration program. It came off on a Saturday. We took some three thousand people downtown at one time on buses. On Saturday the City Hall is only open half the day. We knew the strategy was to keep that City Hall open all day until every person who went on that bus was registered to vote. The mayor got shook up because he saw three thousand black people downtown registering to vote, and if you've got three thousand people downtown registering to vote -- and he understands the statistics of apathy as far as black people is concerned -- he knows that for every one individual there's about ten to twenty people who'll sympathize in some way or other but couldn't make it; he saw this as a basis of power. And he went to the University and told them, "Look, I don't care if you had this on the drawing board for twenty years, you are not going to take a black community in Chicago that has demonstrated its power and put me in the bag a loser, a loser of my political controls in relationship to the Democratic Party in that city." The University and the Mayor got together and the mayor finally told them there's not going to be no urban renewal program here. The community had won its first victory. Black people don't think that they can win. They didn't think that they could win. You know, you hear this concept lots of times from people: "We're going to go into this battle and we're going to go down fighting." Well that had to be reversed to say that we are going to win, not that we're going to go down fighting. That's the same thing I'm talking about education. You come in with the concept, "Well if we can teach them by eighth grade to read 3. 0 we've done a good job," if reading is your thing and that's what you want to do.

So when T. W. O. went on to other things like rent strikes; how did they work? A man owns a slum building and he's called in by the housing committee and the people in the building organize and he says, "The hell with that housing committee, I'm not coming in there. I'm going to have to go down there and talk to these black folks," because he's white and he lives in suburbia somewhere and owns this building. So what do you do when he doesn't come in? You find out where he lives and you go out to his house and you make up some little leaflets saying that Mr. Jones who lives at 1919 East River Road owns a slum building at 6223 Kimbark, and give his home phone number. And you march up and down that whole block and the people don't get shook up; they are sympathetic that he owns a slum building. The only thing they want is to get them black folks out of their neighborhood, and they call him up and they tell him, "Listen, we don't care what you do buddy, but you better do something to make sure these people don't come back here or else." White people know what power is. He knew that those people would force him out of their neighborhood and, he liked living there; so next week he comes in and he's going to deal with you and he's going to fix up that building.

And the same thing with the business community. How do you deal with a business community that's been stealing for years? What we did was to organize a big demonstration. One Saturday afternoon in the middle of the shopping period, a thousand people walked down the middle of the street blocking all the traffic, with signs: 'The community demands a square deal in the business community.' The business community with the longest established business association in the city of Chicago besides the Chamber of Commerce had to capitulate because they saw that once you start that kind of thing, then each individual store was going to be watched and viewed and demonstrated against to put them out of business; some were put out of business because they didn't believe it. The thing that made it important was that the business men themselves began to be the watchdog over other businessmen. When a guy was caught with some unscrupulous practice, they called him in and said, "Look, you're messing with all of our self interest and we're not going to have that."

Or say you have fifteen white-owned liquor stores in one block. You organize a whole precinct. You go back to those people for a month, day in and day out, and you tell them why they got to close those liquor stores down: because you got a bunch of derelicts who are hanging around there; you've got a high school not too far from there where young girls and young boys have to pass; all kinds of people are hanging around there. So you close it down. But you've got to fight the liquor industry; you've got to fight the city because everybody's getting some payoff, even the police department. Everybody gets the payoff in the city of Chicago, every governmental agency. Why couldn't you attack the building department rather than attacking that slum landlord? Because the building department has been corrupt all its life, its whole existence; so you have to start where you can to eliminate those problems. I could go on and on about T. W. O. It's been a prototype for all black community organizations in this country, in Rochester, Buffalo, Kansas City, some semblance of it in Oakland, all over; they've tried to deal with the problem through developing power. And people look at power and they say power is a bad thing to talk about; that's only because the people who've got the power always tell the people who ain't got the power that it's bad to talk about getting some power. That's the issue.

Now we talk about power in education. Should a community have a voice in education? That becomes a question. I think the question is whether the community controls the schools. I think the schools in fact belong to the community, that the community should set the needs and goals of education, and the professionals have the responsibility to design the program. We're not going to try to come in and be the educators; we're not going to come into the classrooms and teach. We're going to say that here's a community that has certain kinds of needs, certain aspirations for us here. How many teachers really know that a parent in a black poor urban ghetto wants her son to be a doctor. And deep down inside her, she really wants that, but she'll never express it because it's so unrealistic to the professional that this person could possibly aspire. You look at the field of medicine and you know what it takes economically for a kid to make it through the medical field -- you know it takes $25,000 to $30,000 to train a doctor -- and you say, "How can these poor black folks in the ghetto aspire for their son to be a doctor when they're on welfare?" Therefore, everybody checks that out, so that that lady knows that you've already checked her son out, and you say it's impossible, so she keeps it to herself. That becomes one of the many hurts that she has to accept every day she sees that kid go off to school. She knows that finally what will happen to him, because the school has already checked him out, is that he's going to drop out one day because he don't care. He don't care because the community doesn't have the spirit towards education. Now I think that's why the community owns the schools. When you can create a spirit to gain power to get your streets swept, the community can gain the same kind of power to become turned on to education. I believe in supportive services for people. Anytime you take a kid in school who knows that that parent is concerned and that teacher is concerned about his education and that parent reinforces that teacher, that child knows that he's got to deliver. His parent is backing up the teacher. I don't care how many people say that black kids don't like their parents and all that jive, this comes out in a whole lots of different people's attitudes -- but that kid thinks the most of that parent and he cannot identify with you because he sees how different you are from him. He sees you as an individual leaving this community and going somewhere else at three o'clock. But his parents and he have to stay there. When that parent sits down and deals with that child and tells that child, "Listen, you better go there to get an education," and when the teacher sends a note home saying, "I want to see you Mrs. Jones," and Mrs. Jones comes up to the school with a huff and a puff, but she comes up there with an attitude that the teacher is calling her for a legitimate reason, that kid cannot play the teacher and the parent off against each other. Then the kid has got to deal with the realistic thing that education is all about. That's why the community should control the schools. The community is the only basis on which you can begin to reinforce what the teacher is trying to get over.

One of the other things I think about is the community as an institution within the school, or the school within the institution of the community. The school has never identified with the community. This has to be changed, because the school has to talk about why slum landlords exist in neighborhoods. The schools have to talk about why in Chicago the political institution exists like it is. Why is Daley, King Daley as we call him in Chicago, able to wield and control so much power? What does this mean to you as an individual? How does this affect your life in Woodlawn? If you don't have power in Woodlawn or in Lawndale or uptown in Chicago, you don't have a chance. The mayor only responds to the needs on the basis of power because the mayor's built a political machine that's only based on power. Kids have got to understand that. Nobody ever wants to go into those particular problems in education. You are here to reinforce the establishment rather than to open a kid's mind so he can independently think and develop some concept about himself in relationship to the world that he lives in. You want to reinforce it. That's because people don't want to take a chance on losing a job, people don't want to really open up kids' minds and have them think independently. They teach them the tables. And the kid who can stand up in sixth grade and learn by rote and read off his table of eights straight through without making a mistake, that's what we reward him for. But when a kid stands up and challenges the teacher in relationship to his life, that's another thing. We never get involved in his life in school because we aren't familiar with it. We're afraid to say that we don't know. We're afraid to say that we want to go and check that out and we'll report back to that tomorrow. The teacher has to become all things, has to have the complete answer. If you can't deliver the answer now, the kid says, "Aw, you know this teacher didn't know nothing." But that's because we've educated that kid that the teacher has to know all the things. When we educate that kid that that teacher too has to go back and read and research to find an answer to a problem, the kid's self-concept changes; this is why the community is important. The community can help to create the concept for the kid. But if the concept is in opposition to the school, there's going to be conflict between the school and the community. But when this community sets the goals and the needs as far as education is concerned, then the conflict is eliminated.

Let me give you a little background on the Woodlawn Experimental Project. Two years ago the University of Chicago applied for a grant from the Office of Education. They sat down and wrote up some proposals and they sent them to Washington. Well T. W. O. got wind of this and we wrote a letter to Washington to the Office of Education saying, "The University of Chicago has written for an application for a grant, a proposal to do so and so things, and we think this should not be granted because the University has not consulted the community whatsoever."

Black people are tired of being researched. We're tired of being the study for people's Ph. D.'s when nothing comes out to change the educational program. A guy comes in and he sits down and he tries a few things and he goes back and writes a beautiful paper saying, "Well, you can't do that." But what happens to the people? What happens to those students who was a part of the experiment? They drop them. We've had programs at Woodlawn where between the grade of kindergarten and the eighth grade kids have gone through four and five different experiments. But no program was designed to ever do anything about the problem, to ever begin to try to figure out how we can turn him on. They were only there to research to get a Ph. D. or to write a book.

So we wrote this letter to the Office of Education saying, "No good; we don't want an experimental program in Woodlawn. Not in the sense that the University is a research institution." They wrote a letter to the University of Chicago saying, "Sorry Charley, but the community says they don't want this program funded and we're not going to do it." So what happened? The University came over and they sat down and they said, "Well, we didn't know there was such a bad situation. We thought that we were going to do something." But why do you want to do something independent of the people that don't want you to do it? So the University had to do something, because the University hadn't done a thing in urban education. A great institution like Chicago not doing nothing in the area of urban education! New York University was doing something and Washington was doing something and almost everybody across the country was gearing up to do something in urban education, inner city problems. And the great University of Chicago Graduate School of Education was sitting back just being smug and philosophizing and sending more and more people out not to do the job. So we sat down; they gave us their proposal; we tore it all apart; threw all that garbage away that was in it and so we said, "Okay now write another one and submit it back to us and we'll review it and if it's okay, you send it to Washington and we'll send a letter saying okay we think this program should be funded."

So we did that, after they did what they had to do. So what came out of it was a feasibility study to identify what the problems were, but to identify the problems on a different basis this time, to identify the problems on the basis of people who were active in the classroom, the white teachers in the black ghetto. Why were kids not learning? What do you perceive is the problem? Here's a person on the front line; the board of education traditionally functions to the extent that they never asked those people. They got them down there doing the job but they never asked them what the problems are. Some dude is heading up the curriculum department, and he ain't been out of that building for twenty years. But he's constantly sending stuff down. "Here's for this year and here's for this year. If you don't teach it we're going to fire you." We asked the teachers what they thought the problems were. We asked the pupils, "What do you perceive as the problem?" We asked the parents, "What do you perceive as the problem?" We asked the administrators, "What do you perceive as the problem?" They reviewed the literature to find out what things had been done and tried and some of the problems that came out of this situation. We finished up with a feasibility study. We sent a report to Washington in May, 1968.

Meantime we identified some strong areas of concern. We also wrote some more proposals and sent it to the H. E. W. under Title I. The proposals were accepted. We had visitors out from H. E. W. to make sure that the community was involved one hundred per cent this time. The University could not get this by itself, nor could the Chicago Public Schools, which they did not understand. They could not just go on and the two of them work together; they had to have community involvement. So the Woodlawn Experimental School Project came on. Last May we ran a planning session between the parents and the teachers in which we identified some areas of problems that we should try to immediately begin to do some work on. And this experimental project is different because this experimental project is an action program. It's got an evaluation and research component so that people who are knowledgeable in the area of education are looking at what we're doing and if they see that we're doing something that there's no changes in, then let's dump that. Let's not hold on to something and carry it for three years and say, "Well we failed in that one, you know, we didn't do nothing."

We had a summer workshop this summer with parents and teachers -- sixty teachers and twenty parents. It was unfair, but that's the way the funds were set up. As the thing came out, the parents had lots of ideas. For the first time the teachers begin to say, "You know these parents are not so dumb; they might have something to contribute to this school." Oh, there was a confrontation. The teachers felt threatened.

I failed to mention one thing that's unique about this project or about this whole relationship between the three parts. We have a Woodlawn Community Board, which is made up of seven members from T. W. O., seven members from the University of Chicago, and seven members from the Chicago Public Schools. Each has a chairman who casts one single vote for any programs, or things of that nature. The only person who can veto anything in this project is the superintendent of schools. It has control over all the educational programs and personnel within that community. If the Woodlawn constituent chairman decides that he wants to veto something, the other two cannot overrule him. They have to sit down and try to negotiate, because it's based on the respective power of each one of our power institutions, so they have to come to some collective agreement or no program can move further until that agreement has been reached.

The confrontation with the teachers and the parents this summer was helpful; the teachers for the first time felt that because this board existed they were threatened at every point, that the parent could say, "Well I don't like this teacher, fire him." Well it's not that kind of thing. There's a legitimate structure. We're saying that we're going to hold people responsible for education. We're going to hire sixty community teachers whose job is to work right within the school, people from next door who Mrs. Jones can identify with. When she comes and tells a parent, "Look, Jimmy's not doing nothing in school, he's sitting out there playing all day," the parent's not going to resent that.

We got thirty community agents whose job is to work in organized parent councils. Their job is to get parents involved in the school, not just parents coming into the school and the principal stands up and is pious and sits down and people talk and he talks to them and they shake their heads and everybody goes home. The concept of the school having to be a place where nice middle class black people will come in and be in the PTA is over with. The PTA has been a failure all along in the black community. The ladies who had the nicest hats were the ones that came to the meetings; the lady who didn't have a decent dress to wear stayed away. Her kid was in that educational program, but she had to stay away just because she couldn't afford a nice hat. Well we're going to change that, because everybody's going to be welcome to that school. It don't matter what kind of dress you wear; we're going to try to make it informal. We're going to stop all them hats because the people who wear the hats ain't going to come anyway when these other group of people start coming in, and they represent the majority because they represent the majority of the poor people. But we're going to bring them into the school.

Now how is this going to affect the teachers? The teachers are being retrained. They're being brought up on what they need to. We're working on self-concepts. We're working on the program for the community -- what is it? We're working on the program for what the political institution is. We're not going to throw away or discard the three R's, but we're going to make it relevant to that need. Words have different meanings to different people. There are words that's used by Webster that in a black community mean an entirely different thing. Take "a project" for instance. Now everybody assumes that "a project" is some little special plan that you work on because you're educated. You say, we're going to have a project today. But that kid's relationship to "project" is that big monstrosity. That's his relationship to it. But most people don't want to get down and deal with his thing because everybody's constantly trying to reinforce the accepted mode. I think that one of the things is that teachers should learn what the language of the ghetto is, because this is a means by which you can begin to understand what some of the students are thinking about you; because they can talk in such a way that they can be calling you a whole lots of nasty names and you'll never know it. It doesn't have to be abusive language.

Everybody wants to maintain the structure, and I say the biggest problem with education is that people want to reinforce the establishment. They teach history, but they don't teach history the way it is. History's a beautiful subject if it's taught truthfully, if it's taught about why the United States did certain kinds of things. Not just to teach that the first man to die in the War of Independence was a black man. That's not so much important as why the War of Independence was really being fought, and its relationship to the contemporary situation of black people rebelling against this system. It's the same thing, but we call them lies today and it was a noble thing in seventeen-whatever-it-is. (I don't even know the date, because it's so irrelevant what date it happened.) And how do you relate that to that kid? So people are going to say, "What are you going to do? You going to teach that kid that the only way he's going to be able to make it is go and get him a musket?" Well you can't find no muskets. And the kids in our communities got guns so we ain't going to have to worry about that problem. But try to teach him how those two things are related. Show him that there is some hope because education has taken away that. And the only way that it is going to be brought back is by the community in conjunction with education, with the institution of schools; they're going to have to work together and they're going to have to be concerned about one thing, and the most important thing is that kid. Will he make it and who's going to be responsible if he doesn't?

Participant: Do you have more white than black teachers in your schools?

Mr. Gibbs: Well, in the high school we do. In the grade school, there are more black than white.

Participant: Do you have black principals?

Mr. Gibbs: We have the first black principal. The community demanded from the Board of Education that she be appointed to a high school. All the other principals in the community are white.

Participant: How many schools are in the project?

Mr. Gibbs: There's a high school, and there's the upper grade center and a K through 6.

Participant: Are they quite large?

Mr. Gibbs: I think the K through 6 has about 1, 800 students. The program is to be expanded to all the schools as certain things are defined and proven to be a means of how we can best attack a particular problem. One of the things that always has to be readjusted in relationship to a community is that within a community there are neighborhoods and each neighborhood can easily be identified. We have a section in Woodlawn, which is basically a middle-class section, where the kids come from homes where the parents are professionals or semi-professionals. Certainly you cannot expect to get a program for that particular segment of the community like you would within the Wadsworth community, which is largely low-income, or in another section, Scott, which is probably the poorest section of the neighborhood; there you have the highest ratio of welfare recipients; you have the highest ratio of delinquent problems and things of that nature. That section primarily is the section which the Blackstone Rangers grew out of. They have gone through the Scott School. So within our community there's a "definite definable neighborhood." And each one of those neighborhoods has to be assessed, and the educational program has to be geared towards those needs of that particular segment of the community.

Participant: How many schools are there in the Woodlawn area?

Mr. Gibbs: There are eleven elementary schools and one high school. Hyde Park High School, an integrated school since the twenties, probably is scholastically one of the better high schools in this country. Under Superintendent Willis with the neighborhood school concept in 1965 they voted to build the new high school in Hyde Park. Hyde Park and South Shore, which are both adjacent to Woodlawn, used to be the feeder school for the Hyde Park High School. But now they've got a separate high school in South Shore, and they've got a separate high school going up in Hyde Park. Now the high school in Hyde Park is really being designed on the basis of economic lines rather than on the basis of racial lines, because you've got black middle class people who live in Hyde Park. So it's really again an example of what kind of system we're living under; when you can't discriminate on the basis of race, you begin to discriminate on the basis of what one's income level is.

One of the things that the students at the school are very concerned about and very disturbed about was that we have a track system, where there are students who go into the basic program and they can never make it. When they graduate from high school it's just like they really never went. And the students hate this program, not only the basic students but the students who were the scholastic scholarship winners each year. We've tried to destroy this whole concept, because the student sees himself in a healthy relationship with the guy he runs around with. He can never be in a class with the guy that he runs around with. He can never give him the help. The students have brought this out, both those students who are in a basic program and those students who are in the accelerated program. There again is an example of the failure of the school system to design a program to fit the needs of the community. Here all the kids live together and play together, but we segregate them when we get them in the building and make them feel inferior. We tell them "you're dumb," because that's what the basic program really tells them -- "You're a dummy. We just let you in here because it don't matter that you can't get a grade past a 'D' anyway. You can never hope to make it into a regular program, so you've spent four years of going to high school for nothing." The kids in the basic programs don't carry books because they're ashamed of them because they are nothing but eighth grade or sixth grade books, glorified to fit the supposedly slow learner. It's too easily identifiable. And the kids hate it. But nobody listened to the kids before. Nobody heard the guy who was captain of the basketball team, the honor student who was talking about his buddy who he runs around with who's a slow learner. He runs around with him all day long, but how can he possibly help him, because they don't even have the same kind of assignments. So the kid who's not making it just gives up and hangs out on the block. And the kid who's making it goes home and does his homework, because he's going to make it and because he's got some innate talents, or he just decided to stick with this institution and become institutionalized and learn. This other kid just got turned off very, very early. He just gave up.

All these things have to be taken into consideration when you design the program. The community sees this as a need, as a need to stabilize the community. Education is certainly needed to stabilize the community because it means that you're going to have a high number of individuals who graduate from high school and who go on to college, or who go on into apprenticeship programs. Even the dropouts who drop out from school can get into some kind of program that's going to train them to be productive in relationship to certain kinds of jobs. But not in the educational program at Woodlawn today, because when they drop out they're not making it at all.

I think what we heard from the Navajo Indian, Mr. Dick, was certainly an example of what we have become, and I say 'we' collectively. I'm going to even include myself in this, even though I'm generally left out of most things; I'm going to get involved in this myself because somehow I feel, even in my plight, somewhat responsible for where the Navajo is today. We've got to form a coalition between him and me some way. I'm going to have to try to learn some Navajo Indian talk and try to take my techniques and my skills as an organizer and see if we can work something out together so that we can begin to do something about that problem, because as long as any one of us is not free to enjoy what the masses are enjoying or have the potential to enjoy, then all of us are enslaved to a certain extent.

I think that both you as teachers and as administrators or professors have been short-changed in this whole thing too, because you don't have any power. You have been forced into the same role that the community has. You are the front line in the educational program, but nobody really ever asks you what you think about what should be done in the area of education. Somebody from the curriculum department just sits down and writes a guide for you and sends it down to you and says, "This is what you're going to teach. If you don't like it, get out."

I think the teachers really have to start looking at developing power for themselves also, so that they can move in conjunction with the aspirations of the people who they're serving. When you say "service" to professionals they get shook up because when you think of the services, you think of some kind of domestic work or some kind of clerk in a federal office or something like that. But I think education is a service and I think that your basic responsibility is to serve the needs and goals of those people who are your clients.

The biggest problem is that we can remember when teachers were not unionized and when the communities throughout the country were holding school boycotts. People were saying they shouldn't pull those kids out of school because they need to be here every day. And I looked up and I saw all across the country where the teachers began to organize and they began to strike and they began to stay out of school for weeks on end. And I wondered at that point, what happened to all that commitment to make sure that the kids were there every day so they could get a decent education? Here teachers are striking for wages; I'm not going to say that that's not an honorable thing because I believe in labor unionization; I'm all for it. But it just seems that the whole concept goes, "What's good enough for me to do is not good enough for you to do." If a kid misses three weeks of school because the community has decided that a boycott is necessary for the betterment of the education, I think that's a much more legitimate basis for striking than to use that same method to strike for higher wages. Now I say that what should happen is if you want to do it, there should be some kind of program set up where you can do it so that those people who you say you're so concerned about can benefit still in the educational program. I'm going to just throw that out and leave it because I don't know if that's possible.

I don't think that the people in New York who are in the bind they are in today over the firing of six teachers really want to take over the school to that extent. I think the Board of Education deliberately did that to them, deliberately said, "Here, take this school and run it," because they wanted them to fail so they could end that once and for all. We're not going to get put in that bag in Chicago, because we're not going to take no schools. We're going to say that we're going to be involved, but you're not going to put us up there and expect us to do the job of running the complete administration of that school. We don't know anything about a school budget with $2,000,000. How are we going to break those funds down to make sure that each segment of that school gets its share of that fund? That's the job of the administrator and the educator. But we can certainly ask questions as to where that money is spent, and we should have a right to know where that money goes and what kind of programs it goes into. Is $1,500,000 going into a sports program? Or $1,500,000 going into a band program? We have a right to know that. And that's what we're saying. We're not going to say that we're going to come into the classroom and teach new math. I don't even know how to do old math, hardly, so I know I can't do anything with no new math. But that's your job. If you think it's important and it's the thing that should come from an educational program, then you have got the responsibility to sit down with the parent and say, "Look, for the technological changes that's taking place in society, we have to institute this kind of program," or the black kids and Navajo kids and Appalachian kids who we're talking about are still going to be the parents of the poor. The youth are going to be the future parents of the poor.

Participant: How many students are you serving now?

Mr. Gibbs: In the Wadsworth school we have twelve hundred students.

Participant: And how many parents did you have that were really interested in doing something?

Mr. Gibbs: We had twenty people who worked in the summer workshop. We had thirty community agents. I was glad to hear Dr. Davies bring up "New Careers for the Poor." We're taking actually ninety people right out of that school and putting them into employment in some different role in relationship to that school and the needs that it has. The community agent's job is going to be to work to organize the parent councils, independent of the school. Not the PTA, but a group which is going to be involved in both the communities and the schools. They're going to work with the agencies that exist in the community to co-ordinate the services of those agencies so that the people who need the services of the agency can get them.

Take for instance the problem of health, which to a large extent keeps the child out of school. Lots of times the parents aren't aware of the existence of a child health clinic in Woodlawn, which serves kids from birth to eighteen years of age. A parent is unaware of her relationship to the Welfare Department. We found as the school opened, lots of parents were keeping their kids out of school because they didn't have clothes to send their kids back to school the first day or the first week. That's the problems of the poor. So what kind of facilities are set up so that that child does not have to miss three weeks of school until his mother gets a welfare check before she can buy him a decent pair of shoes, or for the upcoming winter a warm jacket?

Public aid -- and people look at welfare and they think welfare does such a great job. Let me tell you it's the rottenest system in the country because it provides nothing. Have you ever tried living on 98¢ a day? You try it. You try it. What is it, 23¢ a kid for a meal. That's ridiculous! Are you talking about nutrition? How in the hell is he going to come to school and even have his mind on learning when he's getting 23¢ a day as an allowance for a meal? That's impossible! We ask the poor to live on nothing and then we blame them for all the social problems that exist. This is the kind of thing that happens. And the Welfare Department does not make allowances for clothing. They don't have that kind of program existing.

I believe that the federal government is guilty of supporting slumism because most welfare recipients in this country live in the worst conditions, in areas owned by affluent people who live in suburbia if it's in the urban city; who live on a plantation if it's in the south; if it's in Appalachia there's somebody who is living down in Florida but who owns a large strip of land. The federal government, through the public welfare program, pays money to subsidize these institutions that keep the poor constantly poor. In Woodlawn, a person living on welfare cannot find a decent apartment to live in, and the rent is going to cost anywhere from $100 to $135 for a rat trap. You'd almost sometimes do better to live in the streets than to have to live in the buildings with rats and roaches and plaster falling, where your kids are going to pick up the plaster and eat the plaster and get lead poisoning and have brain damage. These are the things that happen. We have lead poisoning cases by the hundreds every year; then these kids are permanently destroyed. We run, on a yearly basis, a complete checkup on this lead poisoning to see if we can catch these things before they develop.

We had a bill we tried to get through in the City Council to prevent the painters from selling one type of paint and to make them do something to it, so if a kid picked up a piece of plaster and ate it, that it wouldn't have any bad effect upon him. The interest of the city is so in supporting industry like Sherwin-Williams and making sure that we keep lots of their plants in Chicago, that they vote down issues like that for the public welfare of the human beings. But they know that the majority of the people who are affected by this kind of thing are the poor people in Appalachia, in the Navajo Reservation, and black people in the ghettos.

Those are just some of the problems that go on. And people say this is not related to schools. It is. All of this is related to education. Every ounce of it. A kid living in an apartment building, living in poverty in an urban ghetto -- how do you expect him to go home at night and study? We're going to open up a study center so that we can begin to bring the kids who don't have any place at home to do this to come in at night and sit down somewhere where it's peaceful and quiet and he can do some homework. He can sit down, and we can have some people there who are going to volunteer to help him with reading and help him with his math. We're going to open up an evening program where we're going to involve the parents in learning to do these same kinds of things. This is why the community is involved in education, because the community has a lot that it can offer as a support to the professionals.

We don't want your job. We want to help you to do your job better. That's what the community wants. Not to sit up front and be the teacher but to sit in the back and give you the support that you need. If a kid believes that the parent and the community has turned on the education, the kid is going to perform better, I guarantee you that.

Participant: Mr. Gibbs, you have skills as an organizer, you said. I wonder if you'd review for us what are organizers' skills for one thing?

Mr. Gibbs: I'll tell you what I think the skills of an organizer is. First of all, an organizer has got to understand one thing, and that is that what he cares about an issue is unimportant. It's what the people care about an issue that's important. I could think that we should have a red building in the community, and I'd try to organize people to paint that building red. And nobody's interested in a building being red, but they might be interested in it being yellow. Because I have never listened to them, then I can never organize those people, because I've never heard what they said. I'm off by myself. I've established myself as the judge, the jury, and the executioner to a certain extent. I've decided what people want. This is really the major thing an organizer has to have -- the ability to sit down and listen to people -- because then you find out what people really want, and from that basis you can begin to get people together with common interests. Let's take an example: a baby's laying out there in the street, right in front of my office, no clothes on, it's twenty below zero. What do I do when I walk out that door and see that baby laying there?

Participant: You pick him up and take him someplace where it's warm. Put your coat around him first.

Mr. Gibbs: No, I wouldn't. I'd leave the baby laying there. And everybody who comes past there, I'd say, "Look at that little baby laying there." And I'd try to get people to stop and maybe I'd finally get a crowd of people who would just stop and look at that little baby laying there. And they'd say, "Oh, this is terrible isn't it that somebody just left that little baby laying there?" And somebody in the crowd will say, "Well what are we going to do about that baby?" And then finally that crowd or that group makes a decision what they're going to do about that baby. And the group decides they're going to pick the baby up and wrap him up and take him to some place warm. The problem is solved. People have gotten together over a common problem. They have become organized because that's a community problem. That's not Tony Gibbs' problem. If I run out there and pick it up, then I'm making it my problem and the community never has to be responsible to that problem.

So that's what you have to do when you're organizing. You have to make people responsible for their problems, because if you don't, then you are going to be solving everybody's problems and they never get involved in solving their own problems themselves, so they never develop. And the community never develops a spirit of concern for each other, or for the welfare of the Joneses, or for the well-being of each individual.

Another example: you walk down the street and there's paper flying all over. And one of the things that people say when they walk through the ghetto is: "Oh, it's filthy here. It's dirty. Look at all the paper." Well let's take it that if each individual just dropped one sheet of paper, every individual who lives on the block dropped one sheet of paper a day on the street -- I don't care if it's a little kid with a candy paper, or an old man with a newspaper -- what happens to that street? That street becomes cluttered with paper, because a block's a big thing. So it wouldn't be that noticeable the first day. But let's say the second day, the third day, and the fourth day, and the fifth day, and the sixth day, and the seventh day they do that. But I wouldn't go out there and pick up all that paper. I'd go around to everybody's door and I'd knock on their door and say, "Hello. My name is Anthony Gibbs and I'm from T. W. O. What do you see as the problems of your block? Step outside and let's take a look." And she'd say, "Look at it. It's dirty. It's filthy. These people around here don't want to keep this neighborhood clean."

And then I have to go through and show this lady that it might be true that everybody in the block, including yourself, dropped a sheet of paper. But it's not the citizen's responsibility to get out there every day and sweep the streets. That's the city's responsibility. And the only way the city is going to respond to that is if you force the city to clean the streets like it's supposed to. Everybody in the north side of Chicago can drop a sheet of paper on the street and the next morning you won't notice it because the city comes around and cleans up every morning. But we don't have that. We have to force the city to clean the streets in Woodlawn. And we have to have our community maintenance committee get a schedule every week of when the sweeping truck is going to come around and we have to have one member from that committee follow that truck to make sure that they do the job, because otherwise they'll cop out on you. They won't sweep the streets. They'll go park somewhere and spend the day, because they figure the neighborhood is dirty; the poor black folks live there and what's the sense of their cleaning up when it's going to get dirty again.

What's the sense in people paying taxes? The problem is that most white folks don't think the black folks pay taxes, so they just assume that all of us are living in a general welfare state, that there's not a black taxpayer in this country. The fact is that if we got out and we cleaned the block up, there would be a TV camera out there; television would come out and they'd say, "Look at those darkies out there cleaning the street. Isn't that nice. They are really concerned about their community." Sure we're concerned about our community but we're concerned about those things within the community that we could control. There are some external things that we have no control over; one of the things is making the department of streets and sanitation do its job. That lady whose door I knocked on has not got to put the onus on her next door neighbor; she's got to put the onus where it lies.

Woodlawn is unique; Woodlawn forces the city to do this, because Woodlawn is organized as a community. In Lawndale we have the same problem, but Lawndale is not as organized as Woodlawn is, so that's why we have problems throughout the whole urban area. We've never had a riot in Woodlawn, although that's the home of the Blackstone Rangers and the Disciples, the two toughest gangs in the United States. The conditions in Woodlawn is as bad as any conditions that exist in

Harlem. But the people have hope and you need to have hope and understand that power is the thing that forces the system to give you what you're supposed to have. The only way the mayor is going to do that is that we force him. The only way the Department of Streets and Sanitation is going to sweep is because we force them. The only way the Building Department is going to come out and not take graft under the table and let a slum landlord get away is because we force them. That's power. It's not because somebody likes us, but it's because we have understood that there's only one way that you can deal with the establishment, as it presently exists, and that is to have the power and to organize the power and to use that power to get the things that's supposed to be done for you.

This is one of the problems with organizing the fruit growers that Jim Drake was talking about; that's the problem. One of the things that I disagree with Dean Griffiths so strongly on is that he wants to eliminate people from understanding the power. They gave those people their school; they gave them that board; they told them, "This is your school." But when they fired six teachers what do they say? "You don't have no right to do that," the union says, "and we're not going to tolerate that." The Board of Education knew what they were doing: they set the local board up for that trick because they knew when they gave the local board power, somebody was going to get fired. They tried to fire them, but they didn't have no power to back them up against the union. None whatsoever. It was a set-up.

I think this is where you can come in in education, when you can talk to the parents. You can begin to help if you're committed to what's come out of this conference. You can begin to use your skills and your ability to bring forth those things that you might assume people know but they don't know, because then you can begin to tear down the establishment from where it should be torn down. And I believe that teachers can be liberated when the community supports them.

Take for instance a white suburban community that's opposed to black people moving in or being bussed in or whatnot: what happens when a teacher stands up in a classroom and says that this is bigoted community, that your parents are prejudiced? You know what's going to happen to that teacher -- that teacher's gone. But people are saying that black people shouldn't have that same right. What happens when a racist principal comes into a black community and he don't care about those black kids and the community says, "We don't want this guy here?" The board of education says, "We don't care what you want, he's staying." You've destroyed all the hope that people had. You wonder why people go out and burn buildings? That's why they do it, because every step of the way they had no control over nothing.

Somebody just comes into the black community and decides what the program is going to be. They were going to take our high school and say, "Well, these kids are not going to college so we may as well try to start building a vocational program." Whose decision is that to make? Is it the board of education's decision that the kids in Woodlawn were not going to be college students? The superintendent thought it was. He thought that he could make that kind of decision and we told him, "No. You don't write our kids off like that. You're instilling in them failure just by virtue of the fact of making that statement, because you're saying that they cannot make it to college. You're saying that they don't have the innate ability. Or you're saying that the educational program is not going to get better so they can make it to college. You are saying lots of things, when you tell us what kind of school you think we ought to have in the neighborhood."

You can use these same methods to organize parents for support of the schools that I described as you use to organize a boycott. When you stand up in a school and you teach what democracy really is and some of the shortcomings of it, if you've got that community supporting you for telling the truth, no board of education is going to remove you. And teachers can have the power to change this system if they want to. But you've got to get the community's support behind them because without that, you'll stand powerless and they will destroy you. They'll destroy each and every person who takes an individual step in education; but the community is your safeguard.

Now it depends upon how you want to line up with the community. Do you want to be opposed to it in education and say, "Keep out because you're not educators," or do you want to take the position that I told you what we really want as far as education is concerned? How do you want to be in it?

I hope that answered how we organize and how that organization or those skills in organizing can be used for what you might call constructive programs. As the mayor would view it, it depends on whether you're talking about the means or the ends. The mayor sees it as a negative approach because it's saying you rub raw the souls of discontent that people have. You motivate them to get involved in life and you're disturbing their lives -- I want you to know that -- and people don't like to be disturbed, so when you disturb their life and you get them involved and they become committed, they become more angry and they become more independent. That's why we have three independent aldermen in our neighborhood, rather than machine-controlled Democrats. I'm not trying to kick the Democratic Party, don't make me no difference one way or another, but we have independents because of these reasons, because we've got an independent atmosphere in our neighborhood.

We've got a white man who's an alderman. Woodlawn sits right in his district, and we elected a white man over a black man three times. We've got seven black aldermen in the City Council -- seven Negro aldermen, excuse me -- and they're not worth nothing. Black people in Chicago for a long time had to say the only black man we got in the City Council is the alderman from our district, because he's the only one that stands up and hollers for black people against the mayor. He decided that he's not going to stand with the establishment; those seven Negroes decided they were going to stand with the establishment. We've got problems too. I believe in black power. If you think that I'm irresponsible -- we were called irresponsible by one of the speakers at this conference -- I might be an irresponsible individual then, because I believe in black power. But I think what I'm talking about in relationship to black power is constructive, because I think what I'm doing in relationship to black power is constructive. I'm not telling people to burn down buildings; I'm telling people that you've got to develop power so that you can have another alternative rather than burning down a building.

[Mr. Gibbs leaves for another meeting at this point.]

Participant: Parents scare teachers a good part of the time, even when they don't mean to, and certainly teachers scare parents a good part of the time even though they don't mean to. But looking at this teacher, how would you have this teacher see the community?

Mrs. Bufford: Well, in the workshops, this was the first time that a teacher and a parent really had an opportunity and a chance to get together. Now when we first went in, the teachers looked up and saw twenty parents coming in at one time -- you know about what happened! When I went in myself I went in with the thought, "Gee whiz, all those professionals," and I had to fight with myself to break down this barrier. Once the barriers were broke down, we began to realize that we are human beings and we are people and we all make mistakes. Now they had a conversation going on, they wanted to blame the teachers for everything that happened. I didn't agree with this. I couldn't sit up and accuse you of all the failure. I have to look at myself as a parent for the simple reason I'm the first one that have my child, from a baby. I got a mind here, an intelligent mind that hasn't been corrupted. I've got to build this mind, construct it. I've got to channel this mind in the right direction. So how do I act at home with my child? What is my attitude toward my own child at home? What kind of parent am I? These are questions I have to ask myself. We came up with a proposal that says, "No brutality in the school room from the teacher." Then I thought, "How many parents are brutal to their own children? How many times have I screamed at my own child? But you go to school and tell the teacher you don't scream at my child. What makes the difference in my screaming and her screaming? It had the same effect on the child." Now I knew I was guilty of this, so how am I going to school and point at you when I have did the same thing that you did. So I cannot excuse myself and accuse you. I've got to face the same truth about me and about you. It's one and the same. If I train my child at home and teach him what love and dignity and respect and order is as he grows, by the time he reaches school and gets to you, he will know how to act and behave.

In kindergarten they leave room for the children to play and then I think they have a time when they make them all lay down and be quiet to take a little nap. Then they might build blocks or whatnot, constructive things. But here of late, when I walk in the school and they've got eleventy eleven TV's, and you walk in the classroom and they got the soap operas on; and what does a five year old want to know about Gloria's Exercise and he's not interested in the news. I know they have educational programs on TV. Now if I walked into school and saw the educational program, I probably wouldn't say anything. But when you get Ma Perkins, we're saying, "What is this? Is this what you're filling his mind with? No wonder they can't read or write."

If there's something wrong with my child and he's not learning, I want to know so I can work with him and find out what's bothering him or what's his problem because there's a lot of things you might observe as a teacher that I won't as a parent. And then there are some things that I might observe as a parent that you might not see as a teacher. So if we come together and sit down and discuss this thing, you tell me what's wrong with Johnny. See, I can take care of Johnny because I believe in one thing. I'm going to run my house. No child is going to run my house. I'm going to treat him right. I'm going to respect his ideas. I'll hear his ideas. If they're wrong and I see that they'll lead down the wrong direction, I'll say, "Well that might be all right but let me show you what that can bring on." I say now, "If you do that, you won't be able to say that you didn't know, because I told you."

Participant: You're unique Mrs. Bufford; you're an exception. If all parents were just like you it would be all right. But it's all those other parents who don't care about their children.

Mrs. Bufford: Yes, I know that. This is why this community idea is a very good thing to me. Now with the parents involved in their community reps, there are people in the neighborhood who can communicate with outsiders. My next door neighbor knows how to communicate with me. I could go in and sit down and talk to her, then I could come back and relate to you. But you're still talking to a parent. Sometimes it takes a parent to talk to a parent and to get her to thinking and get her to see and try to draw her in. So I think it's a marvelous idea. If you have something that you think is good and you say, "Well, Mrs. Bufford, I have an idea on the way of doing something to get it across to the kids." I listen. You say, "I have one problem. The board says that I can't." You know what I'd say to you? I'd say, "You want to do that? The board can't tell us. We parents will go to the board and we'll get it for you." This is backing you up. I don't got to school to learn how to teach education, and that's not what I'm in the school for. I sent my child up for you to teach. I'm going to teach him the right things, the home training, and I'm going to send him on to you so you can give him the rest.

Participant: Mrs. Bufford, would you watch a program on New Math for Parents if it were on an evening educational TV channel?

Mrs. Bufford: That sounds good, but there's a lot of people that don't have TV's. The majority of them live on welfare, and welfare says, "No. You can't have this in your house; you can't have that in your house." And really what the welfare is today is modernized slavery. They have a food stamp program. You can't buy anything with those stamps but food: you can't buy washing powder; you can't buy deodorant; you can't buy toothpaste. So what good is it to me? Maybe if I go into a grocery store, the money that I have I can get all these things along with the groceries. The soap's in the store; the soap powder's in the store; the kitchen cleaner's in there. And in some stores they have the deodorant, the mouthwashes, toothpaste, and toothbrushes and so forth and so on. But they send you that money and tell you what you can't buy and what you can't have and what you can't cook. They give you that certain amount of limited money and tell you, "This is your needs." And it makes you about want to spit in somebody's face. Because I wonder, "Well why does it take so much for you but so little for me? Why do you need so much and why do you feel that I don't need these things and that these things are not necessary for me?"

Participant: Mrs. Bufford, when you parents and teachers got together for communication dialogue, you came up with a number of proposals. Could you be more specific and give us examples of what these proposals were, like you've discussed one saying, "Thou shalt not beat children?" (Of course, that's a two way street.) What are some of these proposals that you did?

Mrs. Bufford: What we called physical plant, the interior of the school, which in Wadsworth is in terrible shape. Not only Wadsworth, most of them. The walls and the floors are dirty and filthy. The windows are all out, different things like this. When we came up with this proposal, we were told that the board of education says that they only decorate once in eight years; that the board didn't have, or said they didn't have, any money for this.

Participant: And was the school decorated in eight years? This is the other problem people sometimes complain about. The board says they'll do it in eight years but they don't do it.

Mrs. Bufford: They don't do it. I remember one of the principals was saying that he had been trying for two or three years to get one item and he hasn't got it yet. They have what they call an upper grade center in which they don't have the materials, they don't have available space, they don't have nothing. And them kids are graduating out of that school from eighth grade with a fourth grade reading level. So how do they go into high school and make it? They don't. So I said one thing. I said, "Now everybody wants to accuse the other fellow. We all might as well admit as parents and as teachers we have failed. Now, we have been doing a lot of talk, we've got to shut our mouths and start doing." We have to get down to the nitty-gritty now.

Participant: Is there incorporated into this project a career ladder for poor parents and a career ladder within the school system beginning with auxiliary work? If there is, how does it work or how do you like it?

Mrs. Bufford: Yes. You have the community teachers that works in the classroom with the teacher. She works with the teacher. She doesn't go in taking over the teacher's class, she's there to help the teacher. And the community reps help the parents in the community and explain what's going on and what's happening and try to bring them in.

Participant: Does each teacher have a community aide?

Mrs. Bufford: I think there are between sixty and ninety of them.

Participant: They would be shared among quite a few teachers, then. How do you choose who becomes a community rep?

Mrs. Bufford: They didn't choose. They had the applications. The parents that had worked through the summer workshop had first choice because they understood and knew. They had worked with the teachers; they knew the teachers and the teachers knew them. So they felt that it was no more than fair, since they had worked all summer, that they have first opportunity to these positions. So they went in and they filled out their applications and they were hired.

Participant: Do they pay these people?

Mrs. Bufford: Yes. The community rep makes about $375 a month.

Participant: You say that everyone that applied was accepted then? Anybody that wanted to do it could? There wasn't anyone turned down?

Mrs. Bufford: Not that I know of.

Mr. Armin Beck: Center for Inner City Studies, Chicago

Mr. Armin Beck is a member of the faculty of the Center for Inner City Studies in Chicago. Though he is in some senses an academician, he is also a member of the "Community Committee" which is advisory to the Tri-University Project and CONPASS. And for a very good reason. Much of the talk of the conference, particularly talk by white people from institutions of Higher Education, could be construed as going something like this: "My goodness what we -- what white civilization -- have done to you! Please give us your hand, and we will help you now to find your proper place in our world." And the community representative's response was the wry smile and the turning away of a hand which it has seen too many times before.

When pride and self-control are significant to a man, the hands extended to "help" him become too easily -- and are too easily seen as -- hands which control. When the "horrible and horribly destructive" offer to change others without changing themselves and their institutions, the game is not regeneration but self-exculpation.

Mr. Beck says perhaps as clearly as did anyone at the conference what real things white academics can do: how they can lance and where. His discussion of how teachers ought to be trained for hard-core ghetto areas are as specific, detailed and useful as any offered at the conference. His hope for teachers who act like "a pride of lions" is the hope for teachers who will learn the autonomy, humanity, and pride of true community leaders.

Mr. Armin Beck
Center for Inner City Studies, Chicago

I represent the Center for Inner City Studies in Chicago. There is a fulltime faculty of nine people, all of whom are black except for me. After listening to the eloquent spokesmen, starting with Mr. Chambers this morning and going through to Mrs. Bufford this evening, for the communities, I can only say I'm humbly grateful for being included.

I'd like to spend just a moment speaking primarily to those of us who are in the education business, whether in college or public school. I would submit that the universities are not equipped to handle the problems that we've heard today. We've heard them, as I say, from Mr. Chambers through Mrs. Bufford. Each person who spoke has a different set of problems. And the thing that it seems to me came through as clearly as crystal is that these problems are not to be found in the communities, they're to be found in the establishment, in the organizations that run the communities. And these, in our case, are the schools. And how are we equipped to study ourselves to such an extent, to examine ourselves to such a degree, that we're willing to make structural, functional changes, when you see for yourselves after listening to these community people today that they're not 'responsible people?' Not one of them is 'responsible,' in the eyes of the establishment. A few weeks ago, I was at a small conference with one of the district superintendents and other academics in Chicago. This superintendent tried to get us to define for him how he could respond to the community -- that responsible portion of the community. Are the people whom we have heard today from California not responsible people? From Chicago, from Appalachia not responsible? How are we going to learn to deal with these people whom we have regarded as irresponsible and come up with something other than what we've already come up with?

I was heartened when I listened to Dean Griffiths because he spoke of establishing R and D Centers in the institutions. All I could think of was "Now, he has five hundred and fifty people on his faculty, each of whom has an empire. What he's trying to do here, is to isolate them so that they could do the least amount of harm in the communities and in the schools." But I was disheartened in his next point, when he said that the university needs to get a closer relationship with the communities.

The type of research that we've carried on has traditionally been for one primary purpose -- to support 'us' and to condemn 'them.' And we've succeeded almost every time, whether it's Moynihan's report on the Negro family or whatever it happens to be. We win; they lose, and research backs it up. We're not qualified yet, there aren't enough people in the United States qualified, to carry on the sort of research that at least equalizes the battle between 'them' and 'us.' There are very few black researchers, for example, who have been able to come up with the sort of research required to put a different frame of reference on the negative responses which are implicit in and developed by the type of research on black people that we white people carry on. I know that I oversimplify, but I do so to drive home the point that 'our' research serves often to confirm the values of 'our' system, and its inequities. How can we answer the problem, rather than simply looking at if from our frame of reference? It seems to me that Mr. Drake from California talked about it a little bit when he said that he would like to see the teachers form a coalition with the community, and not with the growers. Mr. Gibbs described the 'growers' in every large city: the 'growers' are the boards of education.

A colleague of mine at the Center speaks a parable sometimes, in this way: there is a bowman, and there's a man. And the bowman with his bow and arrow finds this man in the corner, and he shoots him in the chest; the man falls and starts to bleed and moan and so on. The bowman calls in a group of helpers -- social psychologists, anthropologists, and the other behavioral scientists -- and they start to take notes. As they begin to take notes, they check his pulse, his coloration, his reactions to what's going on, and as soon as they have all their data collected they appoint someone to twist the arrows (this is a before/after sort of thing), and now they're getting a whole new set of data. And they're studying him and studying him, and where is the bowman? Off finding somebody else.

Now in this analogy who are the bowmen and who are the victims? Well, we're the bowmen, we in the colleges and universities and in the schools. We're the bowmen. And the losers, the people whom we have traditionally considered to be losers, the people we define as being 'disadvantaged,' these are the victims.

What happened to the 'disadvantaged' after World War II? Congress gave millions of dollars to ask them, "How do you feel you're disadvantaged, having gone through the war now and missed out on much of society? How do you feel that you're disadvantaged? Don't tell us. Figure out how you want to get away from your disadvantagement, whether you want to go to barber college or whether you want to go to Harvard University; and here's money for tuition. Not only that, we'll put money on your head and pay you while you go." But these were mostly white people, white middle-class people.

Nowadays, we still do the defining of 'disadvantagement.' We still call them 'the disadvantaged' and we still devise the programs to help them. Now if the teachers are going to be of any value to the several folks who have been speaking to you today, if you're going to be of any value at all, you're going to have to form a coalition. With whom? With *them*. My kids and yours are going to learn, regardless of the schools. Any number of studies show that sort of thing, don't they? But then we have the control that automatically accrues to us because we're white and middle class. It seems to me the others in this case -- black people and Spanish surname people and American Indian people -- are trying to get the same sort of control, the kind of control that *we* have automatically, the kind of control colleges and universities have over school systems automatically. The communities represented here want that sort of control as well.

Now as the teachers begin to form these coalitions with groups underrepresented in education, they may well change things. It has happened in some rare occasions around the country; it has happened and it has not been unsuccessful. I can't say that there are any data that show the children's achievement scores have improved particularly on the basis of this. But what about self-concept? Even the Coleman Report admits that it is a very important thing. *How are the teachers going to begin to form these coalitions which will improve the child's self-concept, the group's self-concept*? This is the sum and substance of what the universities and colleges ought to be involved with -- techniques for forming the proper coalitions to help the government of the schools, so as eventually to make them 'belong' to the children and their parents.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION

Mr. Armin Beck
Center for Inner City Studies: Chicago

GROUP DISCUSSION

Resource Person:
Mr. Armin Beck
Center for Inner City Studies in Chicago
Chairman: Howard Munson

Mr. Armin Beck: The institution I represent is called the Center for Inner City Studies in Chicago. It's partly a graduate teaching program and its purpose is to train people to work in the inner city, whether they are teachers or nurses or police or jail-wardens or jail-keepers. Primarily, however, we work with teachers; I suspect that over half of our student body are teachers. About 75 per cent of the student body is black. The location of the institution is on Chicago's south side. The full-time faculty is black, with the exception of me. We direct a program here called the Midwest Program for School Desegregation and Negro Educational Opportunity.

In reacting very briefly to the two speakers at the beginning of this conference, particularly to Dick Foster, the superintendent from California, one of several things that occurred to me was that very rarely does adequate change come about without some sort of confrontation, and this is true of change regarding racial awareness. And one of the training activities at our institution is designed to help people begin to confront others at their various levels of training. It applies to the teacher, the administrator, and the college professor. Teachers are more and more beginning to take a view that they are just as important as the rest of the school system. They have begun to feel that if they don't do the organizing of their own profession and of their own neighborhood, if they wait for others to do it, they may have a long wait. It has been a long wait, and it may be even longer.

Several communities have called on our Center for support. Several years ago, there was a school which was primarily black. It had a white female principal. This woman had continued to deny the kind of values Mr. Chambers requires, so the parents (just a few of them who had been labeled as apathetic, probably by the school people or by the institution) showed up one morning and walked around the school building with signs. Things got rather tough. Superintendent Willis, the superintendent at that time, suggested that the principal get sick. She got sick, she went to the hospital, and he replaced her.

Several years have elapsed since this first attempt at a community movement. Teachers were not involved at that time. Two years later, teachers began to get involved with the community in various ways, and some of those teachers were students at our Center. The concerned parents of the west side requested the Center then be of some service to them, so we dispatched one of our best students. He went in and really fouled things up.

At the first meeting of the concerned parents, he observed them for a while, took the floor, and started to berate them for their poor organization and the fact that they hadn't established communication lines with other parents all over the west side and the south side of Chicago. At this point, one lady who was the leader of the concerned parents, grabbed the microphone and said one word, which was a four-letter expletive. Our student came running back to the Center and said, "Wow!" So he learned plenty from that. The upshot of it was that the Center did establish a decent relationship with this community group. They did get a certain type of power (the control of their own set of schools, at least as far as having their own district superintendent plus many other teachers in the administration); but in their own district, the only district superintendent that was avilable to them was white. They accepted this white superintendent at that time. The next stop would have been for them to have questioned the rules which 'declared' this man eligible, and they'll come to that. They'll come to that in the next year, the present school year.

The group on the south side of Chicago got going. A teacher was demoted because he used Dr. Martin Luther King's death in a way that the school principal and some of the other people in school administration didn't approve of. The community got up in arms and came to the Center for the Inner City Studies. The Center with its resources were then brought to bear -- the black students and the black faculty in one way, and the white students and the white faculty in completely another way. This was a step forward in the Center's relationship with communities because the white students and white teachers were able to find their place, and it's not just simply in the way Mr. Chambers described in his talk. The white group was purely supportive, a white caucus in support of the blacks. In this case we won.

The second group which our Center and community groups have to be concerned with, it seems to me, are administrators. Now, it's almost impossible to find administrators who will take a creative lead in developing action programs (as opposed to reaction programs); therefore, we feel that it's an important part of our function to teach them to react creatively. We are supported by student power movements in our own portion of the institution -- that is, in the Center for Inner City Studies, the students have brought themselves to bear on Northeastern Illinois State College, with which we are affiliated. We can learn from what our students are doing and the way the white administration at Northeastern College is reacting to them, and in this way we can train administrators to act creatively when confronted with students. There are all kinds of options open to them, but usually they close them off immediately. In Illinois we're having riots, and the superintendents haven't learned anything in the last several years from those riots.

The third group we're concerned with is the professors in colleges. We have a grant right now wherein we're working with fourteen states and state universities. We're in contact with them on an increasing basis to help them to see the ways in which their own curriculum can be made relevant to teacher going into urban areas. One of the ways is to give teachers an insight as to how to organize their own communities. If they're white teachers, how to organize in Chicago's northwest and southwest sides, how to get in there and get involved in those schools, and, again taking a note from both Mr. Chambers and Mr. Foster, saying to the white people, "Get out of the ghetto. Go into your own neighborhoods where you can start to have some impact," and to the blacks, "You've got your thing to do in the ghetto, which is to organize and to demand your sort of equality." So we're working with college professors in that way.

The whole point that I'm trying to make now is that we need to train people in ways of either starting or handling an environment of confrontation.

Participant: I hear so much about the factions within the black community that do not agree as to how these changes should come about. Could you make any comment on that?

Mr. Beck: You're absolutely right. The reason that there are factions is because black people are seeing themselves as human beings nowadays, and when you're working with human reactions, you have different reactions. The requirement is for equality, whether it's in the administration of justice or in the economic system, or in whatever system of life there is. It's a matter of equality, whether or not we're interested in granting it. The divisions are not the point. The point is that they're going to get equality; now, how? The routes they are going to take are varied. There aren't many people I know who speak as eloquently and as directly as Mr. Chambers. There are many people who are less articulate than me who have the same feelings that Mr. Foster this morning indicated that he hears when he talks to people; they feel a kind of an alienation from the way of life we have right now.

There are many factions in white society and in black society, but I think our concern should be one of bringing about the necessary change in our society, (in Caucasian society) so that people can begin to feel free and equal. I don't think it's very important that there have been factions.

Participant: Well, the impression I get from both Negro and white teachers, though, is that they see the goals differently. They say, "Well, I think it would be better for us to have our own school -- a black school. An integrated school is not going to help us," whereas you see other people taking an opposite position, saying, "No, we do have to integrate."

Mr. Beck: Well, as Malcolm X said, "Every time we integrate, leaving the blacks with the white man, we lose." Stokely Carmichael indicated carefully many times that he's not all that interested in integration, unless at a given point, a biracial mixing can bring about a form of equality that is required for the blacks to take their place, on their terms, in another man's society. Mr. Chambers is an articulate man, a very intelligent man, and generally he speaks rationally. The thing that bothers me, though, is, "How can we make a man, who is a gate-keeper as aggressive as is Mr. Chambers, more rational?" Just as he speaks in corporate terms of hating or distrusting white, so I in corporate terms have now come to distrust black; there has seldom, if ever, been honest communication between the black and white on corporate levels.

What I am saying doesn't mean that this lady and I can't, at some point in the future, begin to communicate across racial lines, but certainly we aren't going to do it today. She distrusts me as much as I distrust her, I presume, because she would say, I am white. And because there hasn't been any communication. The kind of direct communication that Mr. Chambers spoke of when he was responding to Mr. Foster and responding to the gentleman in the back of the room will not begin to develop until we've shed off the externals that cause us to be labeled as professor, or teacher, or something else, not as human beings on an individual basis; at this point, there may be hope for corporate communication.

Meanwhile, regardless of what exists at the level of private communications, there are many institutions (virtually all institutions in the United States) that can be changed to provide equality for blacks, but also for the poor whites in the Chicago area, Indian areas, the Spanish centers and in many cases the Oriental areas as well. Private communication is not a factor. It is communication at the institutional level which is important.

Participant: I'd like to submit that organizational change is nothing if individuals don't change in the organization. I've seen too much organizational change. For instance, in my university, which is an organization, if on my floor there is 'bad feeling' or prejudice, the organizational change is insignificant.

Mr. Beck: I must dispute that again. The overcoming of individual prejudice is an overrated commodity. If we're going to wage war for any institutional change, waiting for people to change their attitudes is like waiting for the problem to be solved before you set about attacking the problem.

It would, of course, depend primarily upon where the institutional changes would come from, what would be the start of it. I'm saying that the educated had better get themselves in on this because they're continually being pushed out of it, and they're continually reacting as though they are in a closed society -- closing the junior high schools for cooling off when there is a racial conflict, for example. Then days later, it's an armed camp -- it wasn't cooling off at all, it was tuning up. People see this and the kids see what happened, particularly the kids who are being moved out of society now.

It is of crucial importance that the educators themselves get involved whether or not they have prejudices; if then the community organizes the school, and it decides to fire a teacher, it creates a reaction and educators get shocked. The institution's definition of good teachers has been shown time and time again to be almost completely worthless.

Participant: I'd like to respond to the earlier question of how widespread is the hatred of all white people which Ernie Chambers manifested.

Participant: This is my first experience teaching Negro children, and I have eight of them in a class of twelve year olds. I don't think these twelve year olds understand, in depth, everything that they're talking about, but if language is something we use to structure our experience, everything that the black kids talk about is concerned with building themselves a private community. And in my classroom they have built a private community into which they don't want to let me come. And they don't want to let the other white kids in; they have developed many techniques to keep the other children out.

For example, when we have free time, I let the kids bring in records and dance. And so far, the Negro children have had complete control of the phonograph and bring in Aretha Franklin, because she's very important right now, and a very big soul singer. One day I asked the kids, "What is soul?" and the reply was: "You couldn't begin to understand!" The hostility is deep. And these twelve year old kids have still got a long way to go just in process of education.

organization, if on my floor there is 'bad feeling' or prejudice, the organizational change is insignificant.

Mr. Beck: I must dispute that again. The overcoming of individual prejudice is an overrated commodity. If we're going to wage war for any institutional change, waiting for people to change their attitudes is like waiting for the problem to be solved before you set about attacking the problem.

It would, of course, depend primarily upon where the institutional changes would come from, what would be the start of it. I'm saying that the educated had better get themselves in on this because they're continually being pushed out of it, and they're continually reacting as though they are in a closed society -- closing the junior high schools for cooling off when there is a racial conflict, for example. Then days later, it's an armed camp -- it wasn't cooling off at all, it was tuning up. People see this and the kids see what happened, particularly the kids who are being moved out of society now.

It is of crucial importance that the educators themselves get involved whether or not they have prejudices; if then the community organizes the school, and it decides to fire a teacher, it creates a reaction and educators get shocked. The institution's definition of good teachers has been shown time and time again to be almost completely worthless.

Participant: I'd like to respond to the earlier question of how widespread is the hatred of all white people which Ernie Chambers manifested.

Participant: This is my first experience teaching Negro children, and I have eight of them in a class of twelve year olds. I don't think these twelve year olds understand, in depth, everything that they're talking about, but if language is something we use to structure our experience, everything that the black kids talk about is concerned with building themselves a private community. And in my classroom they have built a private community into which they don't want to let me come. And they don't want to let the other white kids in; they have developed many techniques to keep the other children out.

For example, when we have free time, I let the kids bring in records and dance. And so far, the Negro children have had complete control of the phonograph and bring in Aretha Franklin, because she's very important right now, and a very big soul singer. One day I asked the kids, "What is soul?" and the reply was: "You couldn't begin to understand!" The hostility is deep. And these twelve year old kids have still got a long way to go just in process of education.

All I can do is just be as human as I can every day, and slowly, maybe some of them will come to believe that I really don't feel the hostility against them, which they think I feel -- no matter what group they come from.

In my class there is a gorgeous twelve year old boy, who could easily be another Ernie Chambers and is even more articulate (he has a use of language that I envy). One day during a history lesson he looked up at me; the thing that was on his mind was slavery and he said, "How come you kept us pickin' cotton so long?" What could I say to him?

Participant: I can understand the hate, because I've been through it myself. I think it's a stage you have to go through. When I first began to study history on my own, and learned all the things that happened from all these horrible white people, I thought, "I can't stand it -- I hate them all." Once you get to know an individual though, you stop putting them all together in a category. My mother, although she hates white people, fought them for the wrongs they did in general instead of because of the things that happened to her. So it's easy for me to sit in my house and say that I don't hate all white people, because I'm not being spit on and being called "nigger." And when someone comes up to me and calls me "nigger," right now it doesn't bother me; at one stage in my life, it did. I think it's a stage people have to go through.

I don't believe that the way to teach people is to tell them that they're dirty, they're rotten, because the problem is that the people who are following Wallace feel so insecure. This is why they follow him. Now, if you call such people "dirty," it's not going to help anything; the same thing applies in the black community. You have to help the black community to see that it is something; that you understand its problems; that there is something you like about the community and its fight with its problems. Then it will come around to your way.

Participant: I can speak of having no sense of guilt for history since I come from Albania and am not a citizen yet. I haven't had time to oppress people.

Mr. Beck: We participate in racism whether we like it or not, or whether we know it or not. I don't know what airlines you took to get here; I don't know airlines very well but I know United a little bit, and I know United is pretty well racked with racism in spite of contrary analyses. I'm sure there are others; I'm sure it's not just there. I don't know what schools your kids go to; mine go to a school system that was completely desegregated some years ago. And yet, it's racked with the sort of racism that was there before because, despite the crash efforts of sensitized white and black people, it's still training whites to take their proper place in society, which is that of the superior, and black to take their proper place in society, which is that of the inferior. My little six year old came home earlier this week and started to talk about Africa; he didn't want to go to Africa. Why not? Because you turn brown. It was summer and he was just as brown as could be because of that. And I said, "Well, you're brown now." But he didn't want any brown to be permanent. Now is this bad or good? It's bad from the viewpoint that it's a mark of superiority when he feels that he has to be relatively white.

What I am talking about is what Foster was talking about: he's not willing to take the blame for George Washington's bastards, but he's damn well willing to take the blame for what happens today, because we're in a position to get at it and do something about it. And you are in the almost lily-white University of Washington.

Participant: I'm trying to do something about it. And I'm coming here today because I'm committed to that cause. I knew what the program was all about and I came here to hear from Mr. Chambers what I can do to work with him and whoever else, to do something about this. And instead of this, he calls me a criminal and I don't know what to do with him now.

Mr. Beck: I'm not sure that it's with him that you have to do something. I think what you need to do and what I need to do is not do something about Chambers but do something about our fellows, our neighbors, us. And this is much more physically dangerous than doing something to Chambers.

Several weeks ago, in Chicago's northwest side, I was involved in a program on racism. The northwest side is pure white, pure ethnic -- Polish and so on. And before it was finished, I had to be escorted out of the building by police to my car; and then they cornered me and escorted me out of the neighborhood because of the hostility that was aroused by what I had to say. I don't consider Mr. Chambers' sort of talk (and I'm sure many of you don't) to be radical talk at all; this is a real sort of thing, that we have to face, the hostility -- several white people who pursued me were arrested for concealed weapons and this sort of thing. What I'm saying is that the white hostility is much more dangerous, which means that that's where the action is.

Participant: I wonder how many people saw the film, A Time for Burning. This is filmed around Chambers, and I knew what he was going to say to us here; I heard him say it in this film. Yet as much as he did say, he also worked very desperately to establish communication in Omaha. He worked extremely hard with a church, a white church in Omaha, to bring about some kind of a relationship. So in other words, he may appear very hostile at first and he says his thing and he shakes you and then he turns right around and works with you and says, "Here I am, now I'll help you, let's see these things." I think you would see another side of Mr. Chambers in A Time for Burning that you didn't quite see in his speech at this conference.

Participant: I'd like to ask Mr. Beck a question. Do your black colleagues at the Center believe that the white middle class suburban citizen can exercise leadership in some community? Do they have any hope that the white community has the courage, or the individuals within the white community have the courage?

Mr. Beck: They are willing to accept the sort of work that I've been doing, which is in suburban areas, white areas in cities and biracial areas in general.

Six months ago, "every professor in the country" was in Cincinnati doing a school survey. Several people in the Center were asked to participate in the overall school survey and we did. We were again a biracial team. There were six of us, and we went down with the view of identifying groups that were involved in the school.

We agreed among ourselves that we would keep various "publics" awake in our recommendations and in our findings. Now the "publics" included the power structure, the school power group and then the elite black community, the poor black community, the basin areas, and the poor whites. In each case we gave them equal treatment with the others and they came up with what I consider to be a beautiful report which was then submitted to the chairman of the group. This past week I got the final report, three or four hundred pages of it, and not one word of what we had to say is in there. There were two pages given over to race and education in the report, and these indicated that no recommendations had been made. In fact we were able to make about eighteen pages of recommendations to each of their groups.

We did a brief study on eighty-four of the largest cities in the Midwest. We requested from them their most recent school surveys. About fifty of them sent the survey back (I'm not including Ohio State, which just released a survey in Columbus); and with one exception, Milwaukee, the reports were filled with lies. Now that may be too strong a term; maybe it's only filled with stupidity. But they were filled with one or the other because race was not given its proper significance at all. In the largest cities in the Midwest, race is the issue. In only one of these fifty places was race given its full play, and this was in Milwaukee. And this was one of the few surveys that was not done by a university group.

So I'm condemning my colleagues at whatever chance I get. I haven't written my response yet to the chairman, but I'm kind of eager to sit down and start it because he's deliberately causing riotous situations in Cincinnati; he's deliberately trying to increase them. Now he won't admit that obviously; it's a "good report" and one that can be worked on, but even if you work on that report and you succeed, you're nowhere. So the answer to your question: "Do my black colleagues have much faith?" is "No."

Participant: Could I ask you if you believe that there is any curriculum that has any relevancy until people have had experience in the kinds of communities you're talking about?

Mr. Beck: Are you familiar with Bob Ring's study, the study that he did for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights? It concerned the largest teacher training institutions in the country. He found that with the exception of the Center that I represent, not one of them had a program for training urban teachers that he believed worth retaining. One of them, for example, had as its major thrust toward training teachers the idea that they must spend several hours in the inner city schools before they graduate from colleges. Now Chicago isn't easily handled: when you get in during the rush hour in the morning, in two hours you're just getting through the inner city; the requirement is fulfilled in transit.

Ring's point was that there is virtually no relevance at all for urban education in what most of our teacher education institutions are doing, and I would certainly broaden that and say that there is no relevance for suburban education; in other words, for whites at least, it's more crucial to teach the suburbanites some historical truth and some sort of relevant facts regarding race. Throughout his study is the idea that there is virtually nothing of relevance to the crucial issues facing the country in the teacher education process right now.

Participant: May I make one comment? If we start to equate relevance with the amount of time that students spend in particular areas, I think we're making the same kind of error that we have been making for a long time, in saying the more people get out in schools the better teachers they'll be. I think we're going to have to work very carefully, and realize that it is not only the amount of time spent with them, but also the kinds of experiences, the kinds of helps, the kinds of resources, that make good teachers.

Mr. Beck: Several weeks ago, there was a faculty meeting at a brand new junior college in Illinois and they asked me to talk to them. I know they had been planning their courses for a long time now and one of the things I urged them to do was to discard their course content immediately and start completely afresh, doing it on some sort of basis along with the students and with the community in this junior college. That doesn't mean that they can't hold school when classes start next week, but I urged them to discard whatever they had been working on, just throw it out completely and get ready to start over on the basis of meetings with students and with the community people. Four of them have taken me up on it.

Participant: What did these people come up with in the way of planned curriculum changes? What might you suggest? Or what have people you respect come up with?

Mr. Beck: Well, let's take some of the obvious ones in educational training: "Social Foundations." Dan Morris argues that social foundations would be found in history and philosophy. There are other places you can find "Social Foundations of Education" where you don't have to go into history and philosophy; these would be in the communities within the city. One person that I know has his students in the "Social Foundations" course build their own, but only after investigation in the neighborhoods of the city and reporting a discussion on these things, continually asking questions of the people they meet in the neighborhoods, "Well, who causes you trouble?" Then they say, "Well, we're getting along okay, but there's this outfit over here." And then you ask the same question, "What causes _you_ trouble?" and before long you get down in the black community to the people who are not in the headlines, _not the Ernie Chamberses_, but the others who are just as active. For example, in Cincinnati a colleague of mine began scratching the black community and came across a man who has a Ph. D. in social science but refuses to practice his trade. (Instead he runs the black art studios in Cincinnati and barely ekes out a living.) He told my colleague that by April there would be several thousand black people thrown out of the Cincinnati schools for bad behavior. Sure enough in April, Superintendent Miller expelled fourteen hundred students from Cincinnati's junior and senior high schools. This was common knowledge for anyone who cared to scratch for it. In the "Social Foundations" work this is the sort of information that the students ought to be investigating.

* * *

Mr. Beck: Dr. Ward spoke unemotionally but clearly to the issue as to whether or not the universities could be really relevant in modern society. He said, "Yes, provided they overcome two problems, colonialism and paternalism." I think we have a good example of the difficulty that each of us probably has in overcoming paternalism and colonialism. I think Mr. Ezer's presentation was an example of a colonialist or paternalistic action accorded to the students, the young men and women with whom he was working.

Now please don't consider this to be an accusation that should be swallowed; it should be discussed. The attempts, though, that were made by him, to justify the behavioral sciences were curious. His speech represented one of these occasions where the "white man speaks with a forked tongue." On the one hand he was extolling the behavioral scientists, the likes of Oscar Lewis, for getting in with the Puerto Rican family that he was studying. But let's remember that this Puerto Rican family is completely powerless, that they have no choice but to be studied by the likes of an Oscar Lewis and his staff, whereas a Richard Daley has a choice, he is not without power. On the other hand, who puts the Puerto Rican family in Chicago in the position that the Puerto Rican family is in? -- Richard Daley. Consequently, who should be studied?

Now when I say Mr. Ezer spoke with a forked tongue, on one hand he was extolling the duties of Oscar Lewis and how behavioral science can make the pitch by getting in deeply with such families. But a little later on he agreed with what Mr. Gibbs, from Chicago, said: that every time he would walk down 47th to 63rd he had to clear out the social scientists so he could walk down the street. I think I agree that it is bad that we continually study the powerless.

I, for example, as a middle class white would be quite distraught if the likes of Ernie Chambers and Tony Gibbs were to follow me around and live with my family and jot down my reactions to my society, when I get angry at my wife, how we close the door and that sort of thing; I would get quite disturbed about that. And I'm powerful enough to do something about it; I'm powerful enough to say to Chambers and Gibbs, "Get out please; you can interview me sometime, tomorrow, next week whenever we have mutual time, but you may not do this."

On the other hand, when we get into education, whether or not we can have some kind of an impact on this mass of people who spoke to us yesterday and this mass of youths that spoke to us this morning, we can continue to study these people, we can continue to override them.

I'm not an anti-intellectual; I don't define myself as being an anti-intellectual, but which was the more worthwhile for you -- Mr. Ezer's forty minutes or the kids' twenty minutes?

Participant: The twenty minutes of kids.

Mr. Beck: It's probably unanimous. I know, for my part, I stopped reading my issue of the Saturday Review when Mr. Ezer stopped, because all of a sudden there was some electricity.

Now, how are we going to break through our own barriers in our own universities, in our schools? Start studying the Mayor Daleys? There have been a few people like James Wilson and Edward Banfield, who have been studying the racist power structure and publishing periodically. But for the most part we study the powerless. Now how can we break through these barriers? I think this is something you folks are going to be involved with for a year; I think this would be a critical factor.

I was speaking to a sixth grade teacher this morning. He's Spanish and speaks Spanish, and most of his students in his school are Spanish. He was describing the fact that the Spanish kids in the school were achieving below grade level in comparison with the Anglos, and I was asking him, "What are you doing about it?" "Well, we got money from the government." And it turned out that the money from the government was going to be spent on the same sort of studying that has been going on which has proved almost one hundred per cent of the time fruitless, useless, and a waste of money. If we have this year to go, how are we going to do it?

Participant: Could I speak to another point? Since I work in the elementary field, this is the field that I like to feel is closest to the problem. What is the American image of a teacher, especially an elementary teacher? Especially a male elementary teacher? Something is wrong -- I'm not promoted to junior high school. I don't have any desires to go to junior high school; I don't have any desires to go into high school, at all. I like elementary work. What happens when we try to speak to the power structure? I mean in this case, the supervisors. What happens to us when we go to the university and say, "This isn't what we want, we don't want to be structured. We know what we need. We want people to help us in this area." Most of the time we get the same run-around, so we go back in the classroom and we make the same mistakes. If we are intelligent enough to realize our mistakes, we try something else.

We need help. We need help, I would say, desperately. It's amazing how well children are established in the pattern by the time they are twelve years old. You have to really shake them in the sixth grade to get them to think a little bit. I try student government -- it takes me four months to get the kids to talk. I even do things like walk out of the room and say, "Well, fight it out; do something." We need this kind of help. We need to change the image. I don't like being a low man on a totem pole. I think the kindergarten and first grade teachers are doing some of the most important things in the world. This is where we need our best people. Yet this is the area in teaching for which the Board of Education hires the cheapest teachers they can find; they won't pay for experience. We don't make the kind of money, for instance, that enables us to move into an area where we could do some good, we rationalize it and say, "Well, I have three youngsters that need braces, so I have to go someplace where I can make money." So we tend to be drawn to the better paying districts.

Participant: Mr. Beck, you made a statement earlier about teachers forming coalitions. Would you like to elaborate on that at this time?

Mr. Beck: From the viewpoint of the teacher or from the viewpoint of the university?

Participant: The viewpoint of the teacher, perhaps relating it to the ideas you've expressed in terms of the reorganization of institutions.

Mr. Beck: If you remember a few years ago, James Lloyd was in New York. I've never met him, but I read one statement that he made after he was finally fired. He said, "If only for once a herd of sheep would act like a pride of lions." And of course he was referring to his teaching profession as the herd of sheep. It's unreasonable to expect teachers to become lions, because the people who go into the teaching profession, by and large, are not lions; by and large, they're sheep. Now, therefore, we can't tamper with the individual in that way, but what we can do is tamper organizationally with the individual; we could create a set of circumstances whereby he has no choice. I was just talking to Drake and this is what they're trying to create, this set of circumstances wherein the individual has no choice but to become a lion.

Participant: What would you call that, colonialism or paternalism? Although I'm in favor of this kind of action, who's to say what's what?

Mr. Beck: Well, your point is certainly well taken and we reserve to ourselves certain rights of definition. Now if we, sitting around here, decide among ourselves that teachers should be sheep, that's one thing, but if we decide teachers should be lions, that's another thing. We reserve the right of definition, but ninety per cent of the teachers may disagree with this. I would say in this case to pursue it anyway.

To create the set of circumstances wherein they can become lions, you must begin in the university and discard all subject matter in education. I mean it -- discard it. It has proved most of the time, from any number of studies that have been done, to be worthless. Once this is done, you create the new subject matter in collaboration with the community to be served, including both prospective teachers and the neighborhood in which they're going to teach. This subject matter can certainly provide a way in which teachers will be effective in their school neighborhoods.

Now prior to waiting for this to happen in the universities around the country, there's no alternative but for the teachers' organizations, either the NEA or the AFT (probably neither) in small numbers -- it doesn't have to be large numbers at all -- in as many individual schools as possible to ferret out from the neighborhoods themselves people who are unheard, powerless, but who have a very strong stake in the educational process, such as the parents, and begin to work with them.

How to begin to work with them? Well, there are any number of models that we can use, where people have done that sort of thing, and each model is different. I think what Mrs. Bufford said yesterday was extremely interesting: "We finally brought it down that we, the parents, had to have one vote and the teachers had to have one vote, no matter how powerful they were or how many they were. So we won, they won." This is the senate way of voting. And in this way you can start to build the sort of program that can result in radical changes within the school. Did that get at your question at all?

Participant: I just partially agree with you, Mr. Beck. I suspect that it would be rather difficult to make lions out of sheep in four years or five years if that is what we consider the normal period of time for the training of teachers, and I certainly don't think that a session like this is going to make many lions out of sheep. I think, perhaps, that we have to start before the university. I don't think that the curriculum is going to do the job in itself. I think we have to start with recruitment. I think we've got to recruit a few lions into the teaching profession. I don't believe that personality change comes about as rapidly as you suggest, by saying a certain curriculum might do the job. It seems to me that we ought to select a few of the lions and expose them to a curriculum and then turn them loose and maybe some of us that are sheep will begin to follow.

Mr. Beck: I agree with you in many cases. We had a ready-made built-in set of lions that came to us after the first hitch in the Peace Corps; I'm only speaking about the people I know, not in New York or Seattle or anywhere else, but people in Chicago from the Peace Corps stayed anywhere from four months to nine months in the schools and then they left. I didn't mean to imply that curriculum was going to change us; I meant to imply that organization was the more important thing than curriculum.

Participant: I think we have more lions than we recognize. I'm always rather happy in my classes to find that handful of students that are willing to take a stand and willing to be a little different, willing to be heard once in a while. It's also a question of supporting these people in many ways that are necessary, particularly once they get out into the schools; it is not just enough to support them in a nice university classroom where you're teaching them some math.

You talk of the subject matter and I was wondering whether you meant just subject matter in math, math-sciences, social studies, etc. or whether it included the ways of working with people. You say, throw it all out; it's been proven that it is bad. What I want to know is, is it the subject matter or is it the way the people start working with other people?

Mr. Beck: The curriculum has its effect on how you work with people. It really has its effect at the point in a teachers' life when he begins to understand that students are human beings -- human beings equal with himself; and one complements the other. Let me be presumptuous here for a minute and just mention this; last summer the University of Illinois asked me to teach a course for them, "Social Foundations of Education." Now I told the dean and the associate dean beforehand that I didn't agree with the subject matter that's traditional and with the general syllabus on it at all. And they said, "We know that; that's why we're asking you to do it this summer." So, I used as textbooks, Carmichael and Hamilton's Black Power, The Kerner Report and the Sextons' book on education (which say in effect that poor kids go to poor schools and get poor education and rich kids go to good schools and get good education).

In the first few days of the course, we tried to look at what we could possibly mean by "Social Foundations." and our paternalistic conclusion was that "Social Foundations for Education" in the University of Illinois at Chicago were to be found in the neighborhoods in Chicago; therefore the students had to become familiar with the neighborhoods in Chicago.

One most interesting example of how they did that was that one group of students went to the uptown area, which is primarily Southern white but includes Indian-Americans, Spanish-Americans and Spanish-speaking Americans and some blacks as well, and they came back with glowing reports. They had gone to the Chicago Southern Center, and came back with glowing reports as to how beautifully "the organization" was handling the problems of the Southern white. And I know that the problems are going to be intense, but I also know the director of the Chicago Center and I know his organization is not capable of handling them. So I asked them who they talked to and they told me; I said, "Did you ask him who's causing him trouble?" They said, "No." "Why didn't you ask him who's causing him trouble? Ask him if he will give you a whole brand new list of people you can try to relate with."

So they did that, and they came back a few days later with a whole new story. They had gotten with the people like Sue Easterling from Appalachia, and learned a whole new different pattern. They studied first of all the neighborhood and then some of the urban problems such as mass transportation and asked questions like: "Which people are being supported and why?" It turns out in mass transportation, of course, that it is the white suburbanite who has the financial support of the government and of the city, whether it's the airport or the commuter trains or the expressways that criss-cross the town. These are of no value to the inner city person, partly because he has no means of transportation to get out there where the jobs are. We dealt with this sort of conclusion, regarding mass transportation, urban renewal in housing, the whole gamut, as much as we had time for in the summer, in each case keeping in mind that these are the people who are the constituents in the school. Now this subject matter was developed this summer by this group and by the people in the neighborhoods.

The second day of the class, one lady came in and said, "I don't agree with the thing Carmichael and Hamilton say in their book; it's radical." "How far have you read?" "I've read to page eleven." And I said, "Don't you say another word until you've read the whole book." Next week she came back, having read the whole book but meanwhile having done some other types of reading, and she was then co-operative the rest of the summer. After about two weeks, several of the young junior girls came up with a real problem and said, "We are having trouble at home." In most of the Chicago Circle campus students live at home; it's not a dormitory campus. "You're having trouble at home? Why?" "Because my father and mother and friends do not agree with what you are telling us or with the books we are reading, and I don't know who to believe." "How old are you?" "Nineteen." I said, "It's time you begin to get your own bearings on this; I can't help you. I don't care whether or not you believe me or the books."

By the end of the six weeks, that was no longer a problem for these folks; they had realized that there were certain things that their fathers and mothers and friends were just not aware of. That was their first course in education; they have to take four more before they get certification. If they have the same sort of experiences in the neighborhoods and in the development of their own subject matter in the next four courses, I don't know if they would become lions or not; I suspect they would. Of course my suspicion leads to my conclusion, which would be that it's the organization and it's the creating of the situation that will turn us into lions, whether we want to be or not.

THE TRI-UNIVERSITY PROJECT'S ANSWERS AND AMERICA'S CHILDREN

Mel Ezer, Behavioral Sciences, NYU

Jim Hills, Social Science, Washington

William Anderson, English, Nebraska

The next three speakers were first year participants in the Tri-University Project. They may be paired with the "academic" speakers whose speeches, opening the confernece, defined ways in which the disciplines, the schools of education, and the public schools need to do a different job in the education of teachers: a different job with respect to one another, with respect to the American community, and with respect to communities within America. The Tri-University Project has tried to explore, through study, talk, and action, the nitty-gritty of what the different job will need to be in a specific locale. Mel Ezer may be paired with Dick Foster in that his speech deals primarily with schools and kids; Jim Hills who is in a School of Education may be paired with Dean Griffiths as an educator, and with Paul Ward as a student of society: William Anderson is, like Paul Ward, a scholar in a liberal arts college. Whereas Foster, Ward, and Griffiths speak from the perspective of experience on a national level and about institutions generally, Hills, Ezer, and Anderson speak from the perspective of a year in the Tri-University Project, a year in which they tried to think their way through to very specific, local solutions to the problems which they personally face as men trying to understand their own roles, in educating teachers and in educating American children. Ezer speaks on the basis of a year's work in behavioral science at NYU; Hills, in social science at the University of Washington; Anderson, in English at the University of Nebraska. One observes, in the speeches of all three men, the reticence which comes from knowing that the problems are very big and that one's would-be answer thought through in a year in the Tri-University Project may be no answer at all when one goes to the field. What Hills, Anderson, and Ezer propose for the education of teachers could, perhaps, give, to the schools and to communities such as Woodlawn, teachers who are teachable: teachers who know poverty and cultural difference at first and second hand, who know their stuff, who know how to act sensitively and intelligently in a black slum neighborhood or a white one; on a Navajo reservation or in a rural "ghetto."

A. Mel Ezer

NYU, Behavioral Science

It's Time to Pay Off Hell:
The Challenge, Change and Children

Mel Ezer
Arizona State University

Before I begin my presentation, I would like to say several things about the conference. This is the fourth time I have attended a Tri-University Conference and this has been by far the best experience of the four. I have been overwhelmed and exhilarated by what I have heard and seen. At times I have felt that I was being run over by a steam roller, as well. The feeling and the passion with which these people spoke, the quiet dignity of some of them, the outrage and the frustration of others are things that will live with me for a long, long time. There is one thing that is of great concern to me and that is, what will we do when we leave this place? Too often we look at people as they almost undress publicly in front of us and it becomes a sort of an entertainment; it's like a movie; it's like the theater; it's like reading a novel or an autobiography. For that moment or for those few hours we're involved, we feel that we want to do something; then it quickly fades from our memories and we tend to the ordinary business of the day. I think that stage is past. I suggest to you, because I hear it all the time and I heard it in yesterday's meetings, that I don't really think you ought to be asking such questions as, "Well, what can I do? How can I help?" You ought to have the answers yourselves. You ought to know when you leave here and go back to your institutions, or wherever you go, that you want to go back and you want to do something. You want to get involved. And it really doesn't take much to do it. I personally didn't want to let this moment pass without at least sharing with you my own feelings.

The general topic for today's discussion is entitled "The University and The Challenge of America's Children." I assume I am here as one representative of the University. My young colleagues (four high school dropouts and two young participants in Project Apex at New York University) represent for me "America's Children." Both they and I wish to discuss the "Challenge," which I have taken the liberty of interpreting as appropriate education for the neglected millions of children in alienated communities.

One may legitimately ask why these young men and women are attending this meeting; I offer the following explanation. It has always seemed strange to me that the meetings I have attended which concerned themselves with education, and therefore with children, were almost always conducted without the presence of representatives of the population being discussed. At these meetings adults with varying degrees of "expertise" were ready to expound on any and all problems concerning the education and schooling of the young, and in most instances these speakers have had solutions to the problems which they themselves have raised. It is very infrequent that we are given the opportunity to listen to young people explain their viewpoints and that we allow them the chance to share their thoughts and feelings about school problems with the "experts" in an open meeting. It is still more infrequent that we take their offerings and solutions seriously. Therefore, I have invited these youngsters to these meetings to share this platform with me in order to have them state their views concerning the shortcomings of their "education"; how the schools have wounded them; the instances wherein they have been threatened and intimidated by the school; and the possible ways by which the educative process may be improved for boys and girls like themselves.

At this point I should like to focus my remarks upon a particular aspect of the activities of the "University" as it related to today's discussions. This past year I have had the opportunity to participate in a Behavioral Science Institute conducted at New York University under the auspices of the U.S. Office of Education. The entire year was devoted to questions concerned with the more effective utilization of the behavioral sciences in Elementary Education. At the outset, let me state that both the systematic knowledge of the behavioral sciences and the processes employed by the behavioral scientist in his discipline have been utilized in education in the past, are being used currently and will continue to be employed in the future. While the contributions of some disciplines to education appear more important than others, the "wedding" between education and the behavioral sciences has always been, at best, an uneasy one. I am certain that in the future, the greater interest in and emphasis upon the problems of education which the U.S. is seeing now will continue to attract the attention of more behavioral scientists from a variety of disciplines. However, the influence of the behavioral scientist and the professional educator must change. They must change not only their ways of thinking about and perceiving the problems which face them; they must change their professional behavior. I am not speaking of the academic hostilities nor the petty jealousies which exist between the behavioral scientists and professional educators, although mutual acceptance and respect for one another's worth would certainly help. I am more concerned with something more critical, namely the importance and relevance of the work of the behavioral scientist and the professional educator concerning the problems facing the schools, and the total emotional and intellectual involvement of these same behavioral scientists and professional educators in these problems. The problems of which I speak are prejudice, poverty, power, passion, paternalism and pride as confronted by the parents, students, teachers and administrators in the alienated communities of this nation. Most people are finally beginning to sense that unless we begin to deal realistically with these problems there may be little left of the schools to study, preserve and/or change.

Poverty, prejudice and inequalities have always been with us. In the past there were brief sparks of insight and inspiration to be found when behavioral scientists addressed themselves to the relationships which exist between the inequities mentioned above and education, rather than to reform polemics and/or academic trivia. Black Metropolis, The Ghetto, Elm Town's Youth, and Who Shall Be Educated? are examples of work done in the past that sounded a warning. But who listened? These writers documented the deprivations and injustices in our midst, but we read and did nothing. We should be not only ashamed but angered that we did not take note of these findings and attempt to deal immediately with the problems which were so clearly described.

Today there are behavioral scientists who not only describe and document the conditions of poverty and inequality, but also tell us what these conditions do to the spirit and soul of man. Such books as La Vida, Among the People: Encounters With the Poor, The Other America: Poverty in the U.S., and Education in the Metropolis, portray vividly the plight, the mood and the feelings of the alienated.

After decades of unconcern, of shutting our eyes, of running from the truth, these inequities, these inequalities and these injustices in human rights have finally caught up with us. Almost in desperation, we are trying to atone for sins of the past. By means of crash programs financed by government and private institutions we are attempting to rewrite history and to prevent ourselves from being inundated by a culture which was born of and nurtured by these injustices. But the behavioral scientist, with a few rare exceptions, has not become deeply and fully involved in attempting to alleviate these inequities. When he attempts to deal with these problems, he hides his passion, sublimates his emotions and, in effect, loses touch with humanity. To demonstrate outrage and indignation, in his studies, at man's inhumanity to man is 'immature', to cry out in shame in his writing about the plight of his fellow man is 'childish', to feel deeply about the injustices which he sees and then have it influence his work is 'unscientific' and 'subjective', and to express his love for other humans publicly is 'sentimental'. Who, then, among the behavioral scientists would allow himself to be perceived as an unscientific, immature, sentimental child? Not many. Some brave few, perhaps. One of these few is Oscar Lewis, who describes what it is like for an anthropologist to give a little of himself, to participate more fully in the lives of his subjects as he pursues his research. In an introductory paragraph to La Vida, Lewis writes:

> The intensive studies of families involved the establishment of deep personal ties without which we could never have obtained the intimate data presented in this volume. My assistants and I spent many hours attending family parties, wakes, baptisms and responding to emergency calls. We took people to the hospital, secured release from jail, filled out applications for them, arranged doctor's appointments, helped get apartments and jobs and helped get families on relief.

Although Lewis was willing to provide time and energy, and although he was willing to make personal sacrifice, he seems rather apologetic and defensive concerning his involvement in the lives of his subjects.

It is the fear of total involvement and the desire for detachment in the guise of objectivity on the part of the behavioral scientist which leads me to conclude that the most important and meaningful contributions to understanding and depicting accurately the lives of the dispossessed, the disenfranchised, the forgotten, the social outcasts and economic isolates of the 1960's has not come from the research done by the behavioral scientist. Rather, it has come from the first-hand experience of members of the alienated communities, from the feelings and perceptions of journalists, and from the analysis of socially conscious activists. I speak of such writings as The Autobiography of Malcolm X, Soul on Ice, Nigger, "The Black Athlete," a series in Sports Illustrated, "Watts, '65-'66, Still Hell to Pay," in Life magazine.

One of the most eloquent spokesmen for the alienated, James Baldwin, in an essay entitled "A Talk With Teachers," reflects the mood, the feelings and the thoughts of his people when he states,

> The purpose of education is to create in a person the ability to look at the world for himself, to make his own decisions, to say to himself, this is black, this is white, to decide for himself whether there is a God in heaven or not. To ask questions of the Universe, and then to learn to live with these questions, is the way he achieves his identity. But no society is really anxious to have that kind of person around. What societies really ideally want is a citizenry which will simply obey the rules of society. If a society succeeds in this, that society is about to perish. The obligation of any one who thinks of himself as responsible is to examine society and try to change it and fight it -- at no matter what risk. This is the only hope society has. This is the only way societies change.

He concludes this same discussion by describing what he would say to black children about the United States and its relationship to the black community:

> I would suggest to him (the black child) that he is living, at this moment, in an enormous province. America is not the world and if America is going to become a nation, she must find a way -- and this child must help her to find a way -- to use this tremendous potential this child represents. If this country does not find a way to use that energy, it will be destroyed by that energy.

a most prophetic statement, made months before any of the conflagration burst forth in the metropolitan areas of this country.

Many such people, although they do not call themselves behavioral scientists, are contibuting to an understanding of the problems of behavioral sciences. In his autobiography, Nigger, Dick Gregory talks about his experience in Birmingham, Alabama, where he was jailed and beaten and his arm was broken. He says of the pain,

> It was just body pain, though; [Let me just interject; Mr. Chambers said the same thing yesterday] and it's getting harder and harder to hurt him there. That's a simple law of nature, like a callus on a foot in a shoe that's too tight. The foot is nature's, and that shoe was put on by man. That shoe will pinch your foot and make you holler and scream. But sooner or later, if you don't take that shoe off, a callus will form on the foot and begin to wear that shoe out.
>
> It's the same with the Negro in America today. That shoe -- the white man's system -- has pinched and rubbed and squeezed his soul until it almost destroyed him. But it didn't. And now a callus has formed on his soul, and unless that system is adjusted to fit him, too, that callus is going to wear out that system.
>
> I thought about that for five days in the Birmingham jail while Martin Luther King was waking up America.

If the behavioral scientist is to make both himself and his work more relevant to the problems of society and to the educative process in that society, I would suggest that he participate on an equal and cooperative basis with representatives of the groups being studied. Members of the subject group must be allowed to identify their own problems, suggest their own hypotheses, analyze their own data and draw their own conclusions in full partnership with the behavioral scientists.

In addition, behavioral scientists should seriously consider a willingness to dismiss the illusion that there is such a thing as objectivity in their research or in their work, in their data collecting or in their analysis of data. Of all the myths that surround scholarly endeavor, objectivity is one of the greatest, if not the greatest. In a very real sense, no behavioral scientist can be objective. If he tried, he would be driven mad by the subjective decisions that he must make concerning the selection of problems to study and investigate, the variables to control or account for, and the types of analysis to be made. It is suggested that the behavioral scientist admit his subjectivity, be honest and unashamed about it, and turn it to his advantage. Let the behavioral scientist break from the objective mold and make his own feelings evident in his work; then, I believe, both the man and his work might become important to the community and its institutions.

It is the author's judgment that the one institution of the alienated community which appears to be in need of the immediate attention and concern of the behavioral scientist is the school. The reasons for this involvement appear almost self-evident; Arthur Pearl clearly states them in his article, "Schools Versus Kids":

> In the world in which education has become the single highway to the 'good life,' the school (especially in disconnected communities) is an atavistic monstrosity. Students become disengaged from education for the very best of reasons. They are buffeted by rules. They have no political power and little freedom of choice. They are faced with subject matter that is dull and irrelevant. Worst of all, the very process of going to school robs students of their dignity and self-esteem..... If the Marquis de Sade could have invented education as it is now, he would probably have given up beating women.

The challenge is clear; the need for change is urgent and the children are waiting. Don't deny them!

I refer to these young people as my colleagues, because we spent at least part of the summer together. We had an NDEA Institute at New York University where we invited fifty teachers from all over the nation to come and work with us. I engaged these young people to talk to teachers, and we had a series of confrontations. I tend to be optimistic about it because, hopefully, these teachers changed and, possibly, the kids have changed as well. We don't have enough time for a confrontation as it usually develops; so we've got a slightly different kind of arrangement, and I've talked to them about how it is going to take place. But first let me introduce my colleagues: Miss Raurie Hickson, who is with the Youth Opportunity Program in Bridgeport, Connecticut; Mr. Joseph Stroman, who is an Apex student at New York University; Miss Kathryn

Walker, who is with the Youth Opportunity Program in Manhattan; Mr. Randolph Williams, who is with the Apex Program at New York University; Miss Mildred Sigueroa, who was with the Youth Opportunity Program in Manhattan; and Mr. Stephen Merli, who was also with the Youth Opportunity Program, (I can't say he was a high school dropout; he's got a very interesting story), but who is now back at college in New York City.

I'd like to say one word about Apex. Apex was a program started at N. Y. U. with noble intentions, and I still think it's a noble idea; the kids from the ghetto were recruited, and all males become secondary teachers. Sixty started in the class; there are ten left now, in their junior year. I don't know how many are going to graduate. Randy is going to take over the rest of the program.

Randy Williams

Before my colleagues begin to speak, I'd like to say that we are no longer in the position of disadvantaged youth -- that you are the disadvantaged; those of you who are teachers are disadvantaged teachers at this moment. We're not going to demand that you listen, but we would like for you to listen and to take under consideration what we're going to say. We would like to start with Steve Merli.

Stephen Merli

I'm white, and I would like to speak primarily to those of you in the audience who are white. Now I assume that we're all nominally against racism and committed to fighting racism, but it is ridiculous for us to talk about how to combat racism and its effects until we realize that we ourselves are subtly racists and begin to purge ourselves of this racist taint. It's impossible for a white person to be educated in the existing system without absorbing a sense of racial superiority. Just as our educational system is a product of racist philosophy, our racist philosophy is a product of our education. All the achievements of all the civilizations of history, we are taught, are insignificant compared to those of the white civilization. Subtle slurs against black men abound in history, also. I was taught in high school that the Negroes were perfectly happy with slavery, as one example. Just as these teachings instill the sense of superiority in the white man, they make the black man feel inferior. A white man with his exaggerated pride could never endure for one day the indignities the black man accepts as the nature of things. So-called liberals speak of gradual change and warn black people, as someone did here yesterday, about alienating the so-called "good whites." I say that black people are alienated, and to hell with everybody until they get their human rights. To say smugly that "we're trying to help the Negro" is to take a paternalistic attitude which is just as racist as that of those who want to "keep the Negro in his place." It is our test not to help the black man's struggle but to provide black children with an education which will make them as proud of themselves and their race as you are of yourself and your race. Then get out of the way when they rush to grab everything that belongs to them. Because racism comes from ignorance, we whites must rid ourselves of the effects of racist education and proceed to alter the educational system so that it will no longer be racist. The rest of the job belongs to the black people. Thank you.

Mildred Sigueroa

I really don't know why teachers sometimes complain why students sometimes drop out of school, because I was thrown out of school when I was fifteen. Now I'm only eighteen and I want to go back to school because I want to make something out of myself in this world. I want to be a practical nurse ever since I was small. Now my mother has tried to take me to some schools, but every time they look at the records they tell my mother they don't want me because they'll think I was going to do the same thing in the new school.

I really can't be judged by the teachers because if I want to do something, I have to do that; you know, you can't tell me not to do it; and for me to listen and learn by teachers I have to be taught. I have to talk with a person and listen to the teacher at the same time because if we're sitting down and listening to the teacher and looking at her, I won't learn nothing.

Now, it's not that we are against the teachers because teachers can't blame everything on students, because some teachers have been swell to us. I have got a smack in school by the principal and that's why I got thrown out of school, because I hit him back. That's all I've got to say. Thank you.

Joseph Stroman

I'm going to talk a few minutes about teachers versus students. One thing I'm happy to say is that we're here and supposedly you're listening to us for a change. But what next? Does it just stop here? There are maybe two hundred people here. You go all back to your schools. What happens then? My problems -- I live in New York -- are different from yours in Minneapolis or anywhere else. Your students have voices and I feel they should be heard. And one suggestion, you can throw it out the window if you like, is that you should listen to your students. Get some kind of communication, on a weekly basis or a monthly basis, for a gripe session. What don't they like? This is their education, and they realize it's their education.

Now another thing I've also noticed is that yesterday somebody got hot under the collar when my colleague back there said some things that were attacking white people; I realize that if you come here to sit here and hear a nice little speech that's going to pamper you and make you feel good -- you can go out and say "Oh, that was so nice" -- and it's really not where it's at, what good is it? You're attacking your school. You're attacked by your students. And you expect to come here and find that no one is going to attack you here? It can't be true. It's all false. And if you think that everything that you're doing is right, you know you're wrong. Jesus Christ was out there, and everybody agrees that He was right in what He did, and they crucified Him. So you know you can't be God.

Now listening is a good thing. You tell us as students all the time that it's nice. It's good if you can sit back and really listen, because if you don't listen, you start getting all emotional and what not, but you've got to be. You're people. We are. Everyone of us. That's the first thing we have to agree on. We're all human beings. I hate to go back on Mr. Ezer, but we're not boys and we're not girls, we're human beings. The same thing in your class. It's a teacher and a student, but they're all human beings. When it all comes down to the end, nothing's going to matter, what position you've held. If you've ever read Endgame, this boils down the human situation to its barest essentials. There's no class, there's no money. It's just you and someone else just like you. They walk around, they breathe, they eat, they sleep. And I think somehow we forget that. You can talk about behavioral sciences; I don't care. Words don't mean anything to me. You know, you can talk about "I love you." This doesn't mean anything unless you show it. That's all unimportant. Words -- you can label things for the rest of your life and put them in nice little categories, but until you come across, personally, I don't want to hear it.

I'd like to relate something that was told to me on my job. I came in late. I overslept. And overslept quite well. I got there at one o'clock. All right. I was wrong. I accepted the fact that I was wrong. And my boss told me that I was irresponsible. I didn't understand what he meant. And it took from one o'clock to five-thirty for him to explain to me what he meant. And the main gist of what he was getting at is that I wasn't responsible to society. Society's a nice word. He described it or paraphrased it like this: "We all make up -- we're all composites of -- the society in which we live. We have to give to that society in order for that society to achieve. When you come in late, you're hurting your society; in turn you're hurting yourself." Now this is funny; this is something I never even realized. I was always against society. You know, I didn't create it. I'm here. I have to abide by the rules and I have to do certain things. It's all a society which I didn't even create. So now I'm here. What do I do with it? In his sense, yes, I was irresponsible. That's true.

But I see a lot of things in this society which I can't take. The political structure -- if anyone has watched the convention, you know it's a farce. I didn't create it; I'm voting this year and I find nobody to vote for. I go to my school. I can't control that. I'm there. I'm trying to learn. This is part of society. If I go down the street, and I'm a light colored person, and people are very questioning about where I am, then they find out I'm black and all of a sudden their attitudes change. I can't sit back and say, "Well look, I'm going to sit back." If a man wants to beat me up, I've got to let him know. The change is here. We can't sit back anymore. As Mr. Ezer quoted, that tight shoe. It's overflowing now. We're getting out of here. We're cutting loose. The Negro is changing. You talk about militant Negroes; I also talk about militant whites. This militant country, one in which every major change was created by a war. It was changed by some form of action which was violent. We started this country in a civil war; the civil rights struggle; everything. It seems to me that man, with all of his accomplishments, has failed to consider one thing: he can't control himself.

You're teachers, you're educators, but you lack; like you were talking about what we have that we can give you. We don't have the book knowledge, but we have something else. We have a communication, a feeling, which all of you need to attend to. Man has not been able to communicate and understand another man from the beginning, and until we start to get to this point, or even try to stop separating ourselves -- well, look, I live up on a hill, I'm middle class, I'm fine, I'm safe, what happens in Chicago shouldn't bother me. That bothers each one of us. If you can walk down the street, as in New York, and be afraid to say "Hello" to somebody, what's going to happen? In New York you're afraid to even talk to your next door neighbor. That's pitiful. We can go to the moon, we can do this, we can do that; I don't care about that. We're going to bring the same thing up there. We can't live with each other. It's ridiculous.

I saw a movie by H. G. Wells, I think it was written in 1939, called Things to Come in which he put the world in another world war that continued until the year 2005. Man didn't die, but they were barbarians. A group of scientists separated from this and said, "We can't live this way." They continued to advance and they went on and they said, "We're going to put an end to this," and they did. They put an end to it and then they began to develop and progress; and I don't mean progressing materialistically, I mean "humanitarianly." They began to live together and it was unbelievable the things that could happen. If we could do the same thing, if we could start living as people, as people with a common goal, a common feeling, a common belief that we had in each other, that we have to live together. Man is not an island, I read in sociology. That's very true. You can separate yourself, but where do you go? You have to live with each other.

What it all boils down to, and I preach this all the time (you can call me a preacher) is love. I call what Mr. Chambers was saying love, because he's trying to tell you exactly. He says "I'm your only friend." And if you've got friends that lie to you, you don't need them. If someone comes up to you and tells you you're beautiful and you know you look like a slob, what are you going to do? Believe them? Don't fool yourself. The time for fooling yourself is out. This United States is reaching a very crucial point. A change is coming, it's coming all over the world. Things are happening in France and England, in Russia, in Japan; these things and the youth involved are changing this whole world. And I hate to see it be changed violently. I happen to be one of those who think that things can change without the violence; but it's going to take a whole lot of digging, and I don't care about books. Nobody can give you a book about this. It all involves each one of you getting into yourselves and looking very deep, deeper than I think anyone of you have ever looked, at what you feel, what is really important. Forget all of the other things and think about you as a human being and another person in that same light. I say this -- become people and not "professionals."

Kathryn Walker

I'm here to tell you why I dropped out of school. First, I would like to tell you a little about the school that I went to. It had more percentage of white students than Negro students. Now, the school that I went to when I first came here, the first day the teachers were very bad -- very bad, but polite to us. But then in a month or so when they began to teach history and different things like that, they began to teach us about the white man did this and the white man did that. Well what about me? I mean I look around and I see a white child sitting here and a white child sitting there, what did I have to be proud of? What could I go home and tell my mother and my father about my black ancestors? What did they do in history? The black man was in chains. The black man got beat. A black man ran away in the woods and got hunted down by a dog. Do I want to go home and tell my little sisters and brothers things like that? I want to go home and tell them the good things about the black person.

When I go out to a math test, I know I have the answer; I raise my hand. The teacher looks at me like I'm crazy. What does he do? He goes to a white student. How do I feel? How do I feel about this? I figure -- I look at it like this. Well what about me? Why, just because my skin is not white, why can't I have a chance? You go in and the teachers try to tell you about yourself, about your black skin and everything. They're trying to tell you, well the Negro children have the opportunity. We have no opportunities. Everywhere you go, if you try to get an after-school job, why, you get turned down. Why? Because my skin is not white? Why can't I have the same chances as other, white, children? Why can't I go to college and do a few things like that?

As you know, many other black children like me -- and well I speak for myself -- we get tired of that. We get tired of being squashed in a corner, have to hear this, have to do this. I want to really get to know my teachers and things. I want them to treat me like I was one of them teenagers or something. Don't treat me like I'm a little Aunt Jemima, a little slave. If there's some paper on the floor or something, "Kathy, will you pick that up for me?" Why? Because my skin is black? Because they have black people in their home working for them? And don't they know that those black people are working in their homes for them and just working for a living to help their children? Will their children be ahead of their children? But do they want to give a black child a chance just as well as they give the white child a chance? No. You go into a hygiene class. They teach you how to say something smart and funny. They teach you about washing yourself. And one of the kids turns around and looked at me. And I know for myself, maybe because they come out of a better home, but I know I wash every day and things like that and then you go into a science class they teach you about pigment of the skin. A child makes a smart remark, "Well why is her skin black and my skin white?" The science teacher tells him instead of correcting that child and saying you're wrong for saying that. What does he do? Break out laughing. I mean how -- put yourself in my place. How would you feel? That's all I have to say. Thank you.

Raurie Hickson

Similar to Mildred Sigueroa and Kathryn Walker's case, I am also a high school dropout. And I want to emphasize that I was not expelled, I wasn't suspended, I was kicked out of school. The reason I was kicked out of school is because I was fighting with a girl; and the other girl got expelled for a day, and I got expelled for three months. Three long months I sat in my house and wondered, if I was going back to school? Finally they send me through all these changes; I had to go to a place called the evaluation center; they thought I was crazy. After that I really wanted to go back to school and I didn't know what to do. I'm really very nervous. That's all I have to say.

And I want to go to college and I want to help the black people very much.

And that's it.

Randy Williams

I spoke of disadvantaged teachers in the beginning, and I really mean disadvantaged teachers. I feel that teachers are at a disadvantage today, and that we have the upper hand. We have given you some insight on the way that we feel about teachers -- not only teachers, but the young people's attitude towards our society. And I would also like to say from my own experiences, I've been in school fifteen years and I have intentions of going further; but I would take most of the teachers I've met and try to avoid even speaking with them because of the type of awareness that they have. Their awareness seems to be that which is gotten from books. Most of the teachers that I speak with sound like a sociology book -- some type of book on statistics or something. And I found that most students that I talked with can't take this type of people. These people are not real people. As Joe said before, they're not human beings, to me they are books. I mean they are imprisoned in pages. I can remember when I was in twelfth grade, my last year in school, I had a white school teacher and I was in the back reading a book on Negro history, and the teacher literally took the book from me and threw it in the garbage can. What was I supposed to do? I walked to the garbage can and got the book out of it, and I was thrown out of the class for a few weeks. The problems that we have in the school system, are, well a large amount of problems are, I wouldn't even know how to put most of them. I have brothers who have dropped out of school because the teachers were, they considered, not kind at all towards their actions, or what they did in school went against the morals of the school. I had one brother who didn't want to go to a gym class -- he was sick -- and he was thrown out of school. The teacher didn't ask any questions at all, just threw him out of the class. He went to the principal and was thrown out of school. Now he's in the street doing nothing. He's trying to get back in school now. So all I really have to say is actually what all of my colleagues have been saying -- for teachers just to stop and think about their own actions, how they would feel if they were in our position; for teachers just once in their lives -- not all teachers but some teachers -- to act as human beings and break away from their books and free themselves from these pages and find a new type of awareness within themselves by talking with students and getting to know students and knowing how students actually feel.

B. James L. Hills

Social Science

Reform in Education Today

James L. Hills
San Francisco State College

The Social Mission of the School. When you ask, "What is the social mission of the schools?", it occurs to me that the right answer today is probably the one we have always given: the preparation of citizens for a democracy. We have talked about it differently. The goal has not changed; only the focus has. Our focus here[1] is "survival" -- the survival of separate cultures in a pluralistic society that operates within a democratic framework. As we tend to concentrate here on the psychological survival of minority youngsters and the preservation of their cultural identities, we choose to put aside for another time and place the consideration of national and international survival. Our total social mission, then, is training students for survival -- physical and psychological, racial and cultural -- in a nation where democracy works imperfectly and in a world where man's talents for destruction are far more developed than his talents for peace.

Our black friends have told us of their need for an identity, for dignity, for power, for control of their own destiny -- NOW! For many, the feeling of anguish is so great that they mistrust any delay in achieving their demands. All wrongs must be rectified instantly. The message from the people in our midst representing disadvantaged black, white, and Indian communities from around our nation is clear: "There is not time! We want social justice *now*!"

The injustices they identify are real. Wrongs must be made right. But the elimination of racism *takes time*, despite our impatience with the process. There *is* time; there *has to be* time, if racism is to be eradicated by any means other than genocide. It is no easy task to change what people say. It is a far more difficult task to change the way they think. Most time-consuming of all is the task of enabling people to internalize all of this to the point of changing personal value structures into new behavior patterns. The Apostle Paul was wrestling with this problem when he wrote: "Those things I would, I do not; those things I would not are the very things I do."

---

[1] i.e., at Minneapolis.

The development of attitudes is a crucial aspect of the social mission of the schools. It takes far more time to develop the valuing process than we tend to give it in class. If we are to achieve this part of our social mission, we have to develop the valuing processes to a point where they will continue with the students as a part of their pattern of living, just as those of us at this conference are continuing the educational process which teachers and parents started for us a long time ago.

Granted the time required for change to take place, we need relevant ideas for young minds to work with in our elementary curriculum. The ideas must be gleaned from a setting which has meaning for the pupils. The youngsters must be well-trained in the processes for grappling with the ideas, even as we adults here had that same need as we met headlong a variety of opposing viewpoints about racial and minority injustices in America and began to grapple with their meanings.

Let me describe the process as it has operated in this conference. We identified the ideas of the speakers, we identified our own. We noted the differences, if any. We contrasted what one person was saying with what another had said. We made these comparisons in our search for common elements and for clearly distinct differences. Following this analysis, we strove to understand for ourselves -- to generalize: "What does all this add up to? How many other situations do I know where this fits?" Finally, in some of the small group discussions, we began to apply our new-found insights to the problems of formulating policy recommendations: "What can I do about this? What applications can I work out that will affect my students at the gut level?"

Our own values began to change as we went through the process described; those of our students are modified in the same manner. But take note: these changes did not occur the first day of the conference, despite the many things in the setting which favored change -- the opportunities for large group and small group sessions, the articulateness of the community representatives, the receptive nature of an audience largely composed of social liberals. For many of us, changes started here will continue long into the future.

Fundamental attitudinal changes come only after very hard intellectual activity over a long period of time. The initial stage of attitude identification is egocentric in nature -- I have my ideas, and you may have yours (of course, I am right). We have progressed to a second stage, an ethnocentric level, when we recognize attitudes expressed by black groups as opposed to those of white groups and try to decide which should have priority. When we reach the point where we try to understand how the cultural setting in which an antagonist is reared has a bearing on his perceptions of a problem and his attitudes toward it, we have reached the ethnological level -- where each is trying to understand the other in working toward a mutually acceptable solution to the problem being considered.

We live in a world rent with international tensions much akin to those we have to face when we consider the plight of economically disadvantaged and minority groups. Our pupils, our children, must become so imbued with the thinking processes and valuing processes that they can transfer them to this larger arena, as well, as a part of their preparation for survival.

Much of what goes on in the classroom isn't relevant, but it could be if we took time to make it so. Let me illustrate what I mean. When I was a teacher of a fifth grade, it was common practice to have the pupils learn the Preamble to the Constitution and be able to identify guarantees in the Bill of Rights. Some teachers even had their students memorize the titles of the amendments to the Constitution. This was considered to be doing a good job in instilling democratic values. If I had the same objective today, I wonder if I could not go about it in another way and have the pupils examine the statement made recently by one of the convention reporters: "If the Bill of Rights were not already a part of the Constitution, it is doubtful that it could have been incorporated into either platform of the political parties during the recent conventions." I would ask: "If his statement is correct, why is it correct? What is there in the Bill of Rights that would make him feel that way? Why would anybody care? What difference does it make? What are the implications? What values are represented by this?" Then I could have them compare our setting and our current conditions with those that existed historically when the Bill of Rights was added to the Constitution. I submit that you could have a whale of a good learning experience that would be highly exciting if you did this. If that set of circumstances would not work for you (and it will not turn everybody on), there are many other current problems that have historical, geographical, sociological, and political implications that would allow teachers to start with relevant concerns. We could then succeed with things that we've tried to teach so long, and have taught so poorly.

Another part of our social mission is to help people see that we don't solve problems. Our longshoreman philosopher Eric Hoffer points out that every apparent solution to a problem really becomes a redefinition of the problem at a higher level. We still have to keep on working. We can improve on it, but it will not go away. As long as people are people, we are going to have problems recurring in the same old places.

If this be so, then listening to pupils ought to be part of our social mission. As I stopped telling them what the Bill of Rights meant, and I slipped out of the role of imparting information and let them find it and interpret it for themselves, they then became involved in the processes that they need to go through to arrive at their own values -- values which they will re-examine again and again as they go through schools involved in this kind of social mission I have described. That is, I hope they will.

Reform in Social Studies. If this is accepted as our social mission, then what about the social studies and what should they be doing? If I may assume the ultimate objective of the social studies is to prepare students for responsible citizenship in a pluralistic and democratic society, then they must have experiences in decision making. If they are to have real practice in decision making, they must have room to make decisions. If they are to make real decisions, they must work on problems, not all of which have been solved. This means working on those problems in which they have a stake; and not all problems are going to appeal to all of the pupils.

Those of you who find these assumptions palatable may see that the traditional social studies, with their heavy orientation on the past coupled with place-name geography, fail to meet the needs of students with respect to most of the interlocking assumptions that I have just proposed. We teachers work over past history so hard and spend so much time having our pupils memorize states and capitols, lakes and rivers, dates and names, that there is little or no time for looking at the events we are living through. For example, traditionally we cover all of the thirteen colonies, but the students learn so little about each of them that they can't remember them apart. Or we may have them discuss the problems of states' rights under the Articles of Confederation which led to the writing of our Constitution; but we ignore the problems created by states' rights today. Or we cover the problems and the hardships of the pioneers in the westward movement, already rather adequately familiar (but not always accurately documented) thanks to the nightly treatment on TV; but we have no time for the present day counterparts -- overloaded airport facilities, overloaded freeways, lack of decent urban housing, inadequate medical care for children, poor education opportunities for urban core areas and isolated rural children. It is no wonder that there are so many reports that for many pupils social studies is the least popular subject.

If my definition of the social mission of the schools is palatable, and if the objectives for social studies are acceptable, then it makes sense that we should place our greatest emphasis on current problems in developing the durable knowledge -- those understandings, those concepts, those generalizations that we want.

This means that we need to take a look at the social sciences as they illumine social studies. They ought to illumine them, but do they for the elementary school teacher? It is obvious from what I have said that the social sciences need to provide the content examples, the big ideas, and the generalizations from which we choose as we shape the curriculum. It seems evident to me, however, that few social scientists are communicating with teachers in the courses commonly required for teacher preparation. Further, in the Tri-University Project at the University of Washington, we found that a number of scholars with national reputations (I am not putting down their scholarship) had trouble telling us what it was that was important about their discipline that ought to be communicated to elementary school children. For this reason it is often difficult to see how the social sciences illumine problems in elementary social studies. However, as we continued to search for social scientists who can provide the necessary illumination, we found, among the geographers, some who have a potential for being able to work across disciplines. As geographers they are interested in both the physical setting and the cultural setting. Some of them are also dealing with ideas in the area of sociology, in the area of anthropology, and are exploring beyond their own fields, as we normally think of them, in order to be able to build linkages between social science disciplines. We found one political scientist who could do the same sort of thing: he began to help us see what generalizations he thought were important and allow us then to choose for our own purposes in developing curriculum.

Until more social scientists are able to illumine the teaching of elementary school social studies, we teachers will have to read more widely than we are accustomed to -- the kinds of books we have not normally read. (One of the shortcut ways of selecting books relevant to improving social studies is to go to the bookstore and browse through the paperbacks. Wise selections from this source will provide one way of building on an inexpensive professional library in the social sciences.)

While the social sciences are extremely relevant, there is an enormous task yet to be done by the elementary school teacher -- clearly communicating his needs to the social scientists on the one hand, and learning enough to understand what social scientists say. The elementary teacher has a heavy responsibility for his own professional growth.

Reform in the Schools of Education. This all comes back to the question of reform in the schools of education and the colleges. The exploration of the ramification of reform involves some risk; the pedantic stance in defense of the status quo, while in a sense much "safer," guarantees no movement, not even in the direction of reform. Joe E. Lewis put it aptly in one of his "show me" jokes: "Show me a man with both feet on the ground," he said, "and I'll show you a man who cannot get into his pants." We must get at least one foot off the ground in order to move.

The status quo is not worth defending when survival is the problem. But in the college of education, on a campus where teacher education is a total college affair, every time somebody outside the education department or school criticizes us, our hackles rise because our expertise as educators is threatened; and often we act as though we had the inside track on how to teach (assuming you don't seek the opinion of our own students). If you are within the college of education and you do begin to talk about the reform that is needed, it may bring you reprisals. Therefore, whatever I have to say here leaves me vulnerable to attack from one quarter or another.

One of the promising things I see is the increasing concern for performance criteria for teachers. This is a direction in which we ought to go. Somebody has to define teacher behaviors that are acceptable in specific behavioral terms which allow an observer to read the performance criteria and tell whether the specified behavior was present or not. Our AACTE is moving in that direction nationally. Some of us in my own institution are starting that way in our courses; others are elsewhere. Moreover, if we can establish these behavioral objectives and make them clear to the students, we might even open up an alternate route to becoming a teacher so that not everyone has to go through college and the present teacher education sequence. I am impressed by some of the community representatives I have heard here today who might be able to easily demonstrate their competence as effective teachers and enter their profession via an alternate route -- were there clear behavioral objectives with performance criteria specified, which met with the approval of colleagues, the profession, and parents. We would then have some criteria for professional standards that would let us "bell the cat" as far as poor teachers are concerned. We could get rid of some of the rubbish in the profession.

Reform in the Methods Courses. At the University of Washington we attempted to set down these very behavioral objectives for social studies in terms of the pre-teaching task (what you do in preparing teachers before they work with pupils), the teaching tasks (what kinds of performances should the teachers be able to give when they are in front of the pupils), and the post-teaching tasks (what should be done after they leave the pupils, in getting ready for the next session). This is one step in the right direction; if you want copies of it, I am sure that you can get them from the directors of the Tri-University Project on that campus.

As we begin to face the real problem of deciding what we need to do to help teachers teach social studies more effectively, we found that many of the things that are usually taught in social studies methods courses do not belong there because there is not enough time. In the past we spent several hours teaching how to make all kinds of maps -- salt and flour maps, papier-mache maps, maps of sawdust and wheat paste -- assuming that if learning to make relief maps is good one way, it's even better to try all the different ways there are. We no longer have time for this because we need to train these teachers to work with the kinds of ideas (described earlier in the discussion of the social mission) that require skills much more difficult to acquire. We began to realize that the map skills are the sort of thing the supervising teacher can develop for us. A new role was established for this person, one that he has done sometimes because we've neglected it, but not a role we would willingly have given him. And, in turn, we methods instructors can help upgrade standards by focusing our own attention on other things.

Another of the directions reform should take is to provide for teaching experiences at an earlier point in the education of elementary teachers. When a future teacher is taking a social science course with his instructor, he should be in a parallel section of independent study led by somebody who is working in the methods area. There would then be no need to change the normal social science course for teachers, thus the instructor could do a good job meeting the needs of the college students who are not going into teaching. The prospective teachers in this separate section could meet together after the social science class: "Here are some ideas I learned about geography in this course. How will they work out in the classroom?" They could try them out and get the social scientist to listen to the description of the results: "How could I make improvements?"

One such pattern proposed was a cluster of social science courses focused on such areas as Latin America or Africa. These would be taught by a team made up of interdisciplinary social science faculty and social studies methods people from the School of Education. The social science faculty would provide depth experiences with content. The methods person would help with the translation of the content into relevant curriculum experiences at specified grade levels.

In this way there would be a longer time for prospective teachers to grow and to assimilate their experiences. There would also be a chance for a person to "try on" teaching on a small scale. Should he feel doubts about being successful as a teacher, he can get out then, instead of staying on and on and on in his preparation.

Alternate routes to teaching careers are urgently needed in order to get more minority teachers into urban schools. At San Francisco State College we have a "new careers" program which waives entrance requirements, provides for educational and personal counseling, gives financial assistance via work-study arrangements, and enables freshman entrants to take up to a year and a half of college course work without grades.

If we can encourage such students to take on employment in the elementary classroom, they can have their first taste of success as a teacher's aide -- paid generously for worthwhile work well done. Total training may take much longer. In return, the economic and psychological rewards are quite evident. The objectives are clear, relevant, and attainable.

We must face the fact that the half-life for a teacher is about the same as it is for an engineer -- after seven to ten years, half of what you received in your preparation has already slipped away from you in terms of your usefulness. What we have said here about desirable teachers in schools, and what we have said about the kind of behavior in which they should be engaged all seems to substantiate my claim. Teachers at all levels ought to expect to have continuous, and rigorous, retooling and retraining.

C. William Anderson

English

The Profession of English and the Training of Elementary Teachers

A Case of Neglect

William Anderson
San Fernando Valley State College

The community spokesmen have told us what they need. They have told us first of all that they need power in their community to do something about their schools. I believe Representative Morial called it "clout." I usually call it "muscle." Let's look at what the power is that these community leaders have. From the first one we've heard, without exception, that every one of them has the power of language. I never heard a more articulate group of people. I have attended the Modern Language Association Convention several times; I didn't hear that power there. I didn't hear the power of language, the force of argument that I've heard from these community people. All of them have described their communities as places where they were deprived, where the others around them were more deprived than they, and I don't think it's very difficult for us to see that the way they got into positions of leadership, that the way they got here to talk to us cannot be any other than the power of language. These people were able to say better, more forcefully, more clearly, more cogently, what everyone in the community needed. The power of language is the driving power of the culture that they want to improve.

Secondly, Mr. Dick has told us that in the varying communities and cultures that they represent they want to keep what is best of the culture that they have. They don't want to lose the past. He described this in terms of his religion. What we also know about the Navajos is that they have a literature. We have heard from the black representatives the mention of books: The Invisible Man, James Baldwin. This is literature (incidentally, we use The Invisible Man as a core text in our freshman English program at Valley State). We think literature is important; we think knowing literature is important; we feel committed to the fact that literature is one of the major vehicles for the transmission of our culture. It's no less so in a deprived community than elsewhere. In fact, when the pinch is on, you find literature. Look at The Autobiography of Malcolm X: there you have a man backed against the wall, and what does he do? He turns to myth-making; he turns to literature; he turns to an art form. Human beings against the wall turn to art. Look at the middle class America described by Mr. Chambers (and I think he's damned right): there's something very anemic about its suburban culture. Is there a great literature coming out of the suburban culture? Oh no. Only in satire is it described; only by the books "outside": the Jewish novel. When you find a people in trouble, when you find a people needing something, they turn to literature.

Nothing could be more absolute than that these community people despise the schools as they are. When they get hold of the school and make it the way they want it, when they get control to do what they want done, they'll need teachers. They will need teachers who have the powers of language. The specific kind of teacher that I want to talk about is the teacher who will work with these two powers whose importance the community people have displayed to us: namely the power of language and the power of literature.

I want to talk a little bit about what an English professor can do to train a teacher to be ready when these people have their communities involved in the work of the schools in the way they want and have the schools ready for the teacher. The needs of the communities are so various that we really can't "prescribe" what the community needs. It's just as well that we can't, because we probably wouldn't be listened to anyway; the community will go on on its own terms. But we can say something about training teachers. In this situation I'm very happy to hear from Mr. Gibbs that we have a second chance; I think we're quite lucky to have even that. If we are to succeed with our "second chance," we shall have to do a better job of running our business than we have during our first chance.

Like Education, English is big business. Every accredited liberal arts college or university can be expected to have a Department of English, and it can also be assumed that every student matriculated for a degree from the institution will sooner or later come under the influence of the Department, almost always in the form of the ubiquitous course in Composition, and, perhaps, something called Introduction to Literature. To be a faculty member in one of these countless Departments of English and thus a member of the profession, one commits himself to certain generally accepted professional goals and standards of training and of performance.

The two central demands of the profession for admission and survival are (1) the Ph.D. degree in either English or American Literature, or Linguistics; and, (2) the evidence of scholarly research in the form of publications of books, articles, or, less desirably, textbooks.

Because the entrance into the profession is through the Ph.D., let's first consider what would be expected of the person who has achieved this level of educational achievement, During the years that a person attends Graduate School to receive his Ph. D. in English, his student lore, the scuttlebutt floating about the Graduate School usually will encourage a blasé attitude that the degree is a "union card"; that, finally, the work spent passing exams and writing dissertations is a kind of fraternity boy initiation ritual. If you can finally swallow the goldfish, you are part of the brotherhood. Doubtless most of this cast of mind on the part of graduate students is a defense mechanism, enabling the student to harden himself against possible failure, or, perhaps, to assume the toughminded, unsentimental tenor of thought which seems to characterize research in the field of English. It would seem that even at the outset of the professional training, human values such as warmth, love, compassion, do not play a large role in the scholastic activities of the student.

Let me hasten to say that, quite naturally there is probably much commitment to such values in the lives of persons engaged in the profession of English as in any other profession. But as the schooling of a doctor or lawyer, an almost absolute standard of precision in scholarship and accuracy in judgment will override lesser personal concerns in the lives of the persons being trained. The preoccupation with a standard, whether in the military world or in the academic world, often will contradict the values the members of the profession would ordinarily be expected to espouse. Most military generals would not think killing desirable in their civilian lives -- they would not shoot the paper boy for throwing the newspaper inadvertently into the swimming pool. On the battlefield it is a different matter. Likewise within the academic world, if a graduate student drops his guard and shows a vulnerability because of shoddiness of thought or a disorganized preparation, he is likely to receive harsh treatment from his mentors. Certainly we can see evidences of this also in scholarly journals, where great delight and pleasure are derived from showing Zilch or Babbidge up as having been a fool in some statement or other.

Graduate School is a necessity because it must be recognized that foremost in the list of requirements for election to the English Club is the Ph. D. To hold the degree is a demand which is virtually absolute and unavoidable in an academic career. The man without his degree, even if he is distinguished as a human being marvellously gifted in the material of the disciplines, stands almost no chance today of attaining a position of eminence in an American university or college. Persons without the Ph. D., with only the M.A., or perhaps those who belong to the great roster of ABD's (All But Dissertation) are almost invariably held to the lower ranks of the profession, given only part-time or temporary appointments, permitted no official voice in the workings of the department, and kept to teaching the less attractive courses. These persons may be held universally in high esteem by their colleagues, but, when promotion time comes around, these otherwise fine people are skipped over because they lack that certification which is almost equal in power to that force that can "Knit/That subtle knot which makes us man."

Recently a study appeared, conducted under the sponsorship of the Modern Language Association and the Danforth Foundation, called The Ph. D. in English and American Literature. The "Dedication" by the author, Don Cameron Allen, a distinguished scholar in the Renaissance, perhaps will convey his feelings engendered by the findings of his study: "To all the graduate students who have endured me and who will wish I had seen the point sooner."

The Ph. D. in English and in American Literature, according to Allen's findings based upon an analysis of 1903 questionnaires, usually requires nine years after the Baccalaureate degree to earn, and is received at an average age of thirty-three. Ninety per cent of the persons who receive the degree become college teachers of English, and, although 90.7% of those polled found the degree "worth earning," 60.6% of those answering felt that it took too long to acquire the degree. Clearly those who had received the degree, and who were now reflecting upon the worth of having it in hand, would in the nature of human idealization of the past think the degree worth having. These persons with the Ph. D. had in time seen it essential to earning their bread -- and perhaps it is not too cynical to suggest -- had consciously or otherwise, seen to it that the necessity of the degree was maintained. The fact that so many felt that the time spent in winning the laurels was too long, suggests that deep within there was a suspicion that perhaps in the larger scheme of human energy, the degree was not all that valuable to those concerned. And, as Allen admits, his study of persons holding the degree allows for no comments at all from those many who found the water too deep and who had either been drowned or who had declined to face the current any longer. Probably those persons without the degree would have a view of its worth different from those who had received it.

During the course of study leading to the Ph. D., students progressing normally pass examinations in one or more foreign languages; they probably also take required courses in Old English and Bibliography; various other preliminary or comprehensive examinations are mastered; and, finally, a research dissertation is written. For those curious to know the nature of the dissertations in English, I would suggest browsing in Dissertation Abstracts. (And please do not look at mine.) A course of research to follow in the remainder of the career is ually set at this point. By now, one is labelled as a Blake man, or a Chaucerian; he is a Transformationalist, or a Structuralist, etc. It will be difficult for him to change streams of scholarship after the dissertation. He will be hired to fit a slot his particular specialty suits him for.

The budding English professor, in receiving the Ph.D., has demonstrated to the satisfaction of probably three to five persons already established in his field, in the presence of the usual checks and balances system of having people outside the field sit in on the proceedings, that he has the markings of literary scholarship of a high order (though these markings may not show in the dissertation very much).

Nine out of ten of these fledgling scholars will become college professors of English. It is thus surprising that nowhere along the way does there appear any requirement that the candidate demonstrate an ability to teach. In some circles, indeed, it is thought that the abler candidates should get full-time stipends with no teaching duties. Thus, experience as a Teaching Assistant, clearly valuable as the background for future work in a more influential position on the faculty after receiving the degree, marks one as less than the best -- thus not as good a hire as the man who never taught a class in his entire life. It is also interesting to note that the recipients of the first American Ph.D.'s in English Literature were described by Harvard in 1878 as "recognized as qualified to give special private instruction to candidates for the degree in the departments in which he himself has taken the degree" (Allen, p. 8). Although there is a certain exclusiveness already apparent in the notion of "private instruction," there is still clearly the inference there that the person holding the degree knows how to teach his skills to another person.

Although at the outset, the Ph.D. was recognized as a pedagogical degree, this is no longer the case. Today's Ph.D. means that the person holding it is trained to do a certain kind of research, a research which William Arrowsmith (in an article in Harpers, "The Shame of the Graduate Schools") describes as an unfortunate wedding of scientific research with explorations appropriate to the humanities, research which robs findings in the liberal arts of the plasticity and largeness valuable to the study of culture.

What kind of research is it that the Ph.D. in English will undertake in the progress of his career? The field of English encompasses roughly all that has been written or spoken in man's history. Either for artistic or linguistic reasons, the researcher in English endlessly explores new sources, archetypal patterns, connections between hitherto divergent paths, and takes all of human knowledge as his field.

As an example, consider the scholar who works on James Joyce's Finnegans Wake. The ineffable complexity of this book, and of Joyce's layers of meaning derived from polyglot puns, or ironical juxtaposition of disparate mythologies, makes the task of the scholar almost as great as the artist's. And then, of course, each generation will leave behind it an ever growing corpus of scholarship, which in addition to the increasing number of literary works to be mastered, must also be known and familiar to the researcher.

From this style of research have come scholarly works of great importance to the study of literature and language. There are the great biographies of the literary artists; there are numerous critical books which illuminate and make whole the picture of an age; there are theories of language and its uses which we can variously call grammars and rhetorics; and there are the definitive texts, accurate to the author's manuscript, which have only with great difficulty been established.

But most of the scholarship in the name of English research is petty, a rehashing of old issues, the peddling of weak wine in leaky goatskins, and almost certainly never concerned with human values in the modern world. Again, William Arrowsmith, himself a Professor of Classics, states the cases cogently in "The Shame of the Graduate Schools":

> In philosophy the analysts are not only senile but greedy. They identify what they do as the only conceivable activity of modern philosophy, but they have in fact abandoned the humanities. In literature almost nothing has happened since the New Criticism -- and the New Criticism was old hat twenty years ago.

Perhaps a scanning of the PMLA for May 1968 can be illuminating. This publication is probably the most prestigious publication in the arena of literary studies, the goal at the top of the mountain for the aspiring young Assistant Professor of English. We find there several articles with "humanism" in the title; but the articles themselves yield up no consideration of what the works there studied might have to say to a modern American. The work is carried out with the pure objectivity one might expect in a total vacuum, and one might draw the further parallel of the lack of oxygen and vitality. And certainly, one does not ever encounter in these essays our initial question: "What does the professor of English have to say in a world in which the study of the humanities does not make men humane?"

Doubtless there is much sincerity in the articles one sees in scholarly journals in English studies. One cannot easily criticize them on their merits as pure literary research. It is just that they are not focused on human or societal or educational problems. Perhaps it is thought that making statements about humanism in the sixteenth century will make others understand the force, worth, or applicability of the doctrine in the twentieth. If that is the assumption, alas, it is in error.

A man's prestige in the academic marketplace is based almost wholly upon the research he has done. His prestige will determine his place, and vice-versa, until the circularity of prestige leading to place, and place to prestige, becomes a true Gordian knot. And as a final chilling note to the overemphasis on research, consider the following excerpt from The Academic Marketplace by Theodore Caplow and Reese McGee:

> Q: Are the men's publications read?
> A: Oh, yes!
> Q: By whom?
> A: By the tenure members, at least.
> Q: All of them?
> A: Yes.
> Q: Did you read them?
> A: Yes.
> Q: Did you read those of the man you finally hired?
> A: Yes.
> Q: What was the one which you remember best about?
> A: Well . . . I didn't read it, exactly. I looked it over. It was in a good journal. Nothing trashy gets in there.
> Q: What do you mean by you "looked it over"?
> A: Well, I looked at it, looked at his references, read his abstract.
> Q: Is that the way the rest of the committee handles the publications, do you think?
> A: I think so, yes, they look them over.

Thus it seems clear that although the English professor must meet a few classes, the quality of his teaching is not assessed in any direct way From such books as The Academic Marketplace, from George Williams' Some of My Best Friends are Professors, and even from Vladimir Nabokov's Pnin, the inference is plain that teaching cannot replace publication in an academic career in English. No matter how loud student testimony may be in favor of a teacher, with a lack of research, the professor will be in trouble at the next crucial point in his career. It is either write articles or be banished to what Baplow and Reese call the "bush league": it is up or out; publish or at best languish.

With this bleak, and, doubtless some will say overly negative, picture of the training and milieu in which the academic man lives his life, the question remains: "How involved is the professor of English in the training of elementary school teachers?" From a survey of the research articles in scholarly journals concerned with English studies, it would seem that the English professor is not at all involved in elementary school teaching at least from a research viewpoint. Just how many English professors publish in journals of elementary education is difficult to say. One suspects very few. And this feeling of a lack of research involvement in the problems of teaching English in the elementary classroom, and in the English training of elementary teachers, might be reinforced by the complete absence of such consideration in the "establishment" scholarly journals.

Therefore, if the professor of English has not involved himself in an overt way in training elementary teachers, are there more discreet areas in which he can be said to function, such as in the teaching of courses which directly confront the questions of training teachers of English? In his The Miseducation of American Teachers, James D. Koerner examines 435 transcripts of teachers graduates in 1960 or 1961. His findings and his recommendations for the improvement of teacher training are probably well known to all of us here. For present concerns, however, I wish to dwell upon one point which emerges from the data Koerner presents as a sample of his evidence.

In the transcripts given in full to illustrate certain typical patterns of course work, there is an astonishing variety and fluctuation in the number and kinds of courses in English which elementary teachers have taken. The range is from eight units in English composition, usually the minimum which would be required of any college graduate, to twelve or fourteen units in such courses as the English Novel, Introduction to Literature, or Masterpieces of Literature. Except where required (California, New York, and Texas) the work taken above the barest minimum is obviously left entirely to the initiative of the prospective teacher. In the choice of courses appropriate to the education of an elementary teacher the English faculty would seem to have left the choice and combinations of English courses entirely to the decision of the student and his advisor in the Education Department. In short, the English professor might be said to have almost no voice in the courses taken or not taken by trainees in elementary education. And Education Departments have not seemed to ask more of their students than the most rudimentary training in English.

Furthermore, we all know that the national trend is to leave the teaching of Freshman English largely in the hands of part-timers and graduate students, perhaps, but not always, guided by a Master Teacher or Chairman of Freshman English. Almost certainly we are leaving the little training in English which, given the present state of the art, elementary teachers obtain in the hands of persons other than the Ph. D.'s and more experienced teachers in the department. The prospective elementary teacher is left with an Amateur Night in Dixie in one of the most vital areas of his training, in his ability to use the English language with power and precision.

There seems to be no universal offering, or requirement, of courses in the English Department in what the New Grammars -- whether transformational or structural -- can offer to what will be the first writing and composition experiences of the children taught by the teachers the English Department has failed to reach otherwise. In turn, a generation of young people will in the fullness of time arrive at the universities and colleges bearing all the marks of incoherence in writing, looseness in thinking, and downright hatred for English that we in the colleges find so bewildering. As an English professor, one constantly hears, and says, "Why can't the students write? Why can't they put even one logical thought sequence onto the page?" For some reason, known I would imagine only by the angels, very few persons seem willing to consider that maybe the sad fact of bad writing in the colleges is attributable to the failure of the English department to train elementary teachers to teach kids to write.

And then there is the question of Children's Literature. In almost any program I have seen which leads to certification as an elementary teacher, there is invariable a course called Children's Literature. Again, to quote Mr. Koerner:

> . . . the bulk of reading in "Children's Literature" courses is in second and third-rate authors, or in those never heard by anyone but the compilers of the textbook involved.

There is other evidence than Mr. Koerner's opinions concerning the courses in Children's Literature. An exhaustive study by the National Council of Teachers of English Committee on Teaching Children's Literature in Colleges and Universities has just been completed. The results of the study are not to be published until November 1968, but they have very kindly been made available for my use at this time by the Chairman, Professor Elliott D. Landau of the University of Utah.

Several further implications of the lack of involvement of the professor of English in the training of elementary teachers can be drawn from this study. Of the responses to the questionnaires, twice as many of the Children's Literature courses (314 to 148) are taught in the Department of Education as in the Department of English. When the results of the study are summarized, it appears that most of those teachers of Children's Literature represented in the population of the research have a B.A. in English, with some additional work in English for the M.A. degree. Only 25 out of 573 teachers of Children's Literature wrote a dissertation focused on Children's Literature. It can, perhaps cynically, be assumed that very few of the 25 dissertations on Children's Literature were written for a Ph.D. in English.

Hopefully, I have established a context in which to make suggestions for change. It should be obvious that English professors are not directly involved on a national scale in the training of elementary school teachers, and the flaws of the professional milieu should also be apparent.

The question then arises, what does the English professor have to offer which is not currently a part of most credential programs in elementary education?

The book most used in the courses in Children's Literature can give us a clue in this direction. The most widely taught book in these courses is May Hill Arbuthnot's Children and Books. This text is followed in popularity, not too closely, by Huck and Kuhn's Children's Literature in the Elementary School. From the earlier surveys of transcripts in the Koerner study, it would appear that the Children's Literature course would be the most stable literary element in elementary training, far more widespread than any particular course in English, and that this course, taught from the Arbuthnot text, would most likely be the major source of knowledge concerning children and books, and therefore of literature, in the schools in the United States.

Arbuthnot's Children and Books is an exceptionally important book in American culture at this time, because by it will be governed the first literary experiences of those children under the tutelage of teachers trained from its pages. So important a book deserves careful scrutiny. The emphasis of this book is upon the psychological needs of the child in his early encounter with books. In more places than one, the reader is warned to keep hands off the child's literary perceptions, and, oddly enough is also reassured in other passages that, in effect, the child's initial good taste and sense in literature cannot be spoiled by intervention from the adult world. Professor Arbuthnot quotes Paul Hazard on this point:

> Whatever their differences may be as to age, sex, or social position, they detest with common accord disguised sermons, hypocritical lessons, irreproachable little boys and girls who

> behave with more docility than their dolls. It is as though . . . they brought into the world with them a spontaneous hatred of the insincere and the false. The adults insist, the children pretend to yield, and do not yield. We overpower them; they rise up again. Thus does the struggle continue, in which the weaker will triumph.

One might wonder what happens to all of the innate good taste and imperviousness to insincerity which characterizes the child, at least in the minds of Hazard and Arbuthnot, when adulthood is reached, where obviously the same absolute values are not to be found. A further statement goes far toward reaching the point I wish to make about this book:

> Certainly, children need books to widen their horizons, deepen their understandings, and give them broader social insights. They also need books that minister to their merriment or deepen their appreciation of beauty. They need heroism, fantasy, and down-to-earth realism. And they need books that, in the course of a good story, help to develop clear standards of right and wrong. Finally, children's books should have those qualities of good writing that distinguish literature for any age or group of people.

Arbuthnot tells the prospective teacher to look for right and wrong in stories for children, without pointing out that in most of the world's literature there are vastly conflicting notions of this polarity. She does not try to define or illuminate what those "qualities of good writing" are "that distinguish literature for any age or group of people." Finally, she creates a rather grand confusion, in the lines above, between what makes literature and what makes propaganda. And earlier we had been warned to avoid offering the child overly moralistic literature. Let's go on. What is down-to-earth realism? Is it an honest portrayal of sex, prostitution, adultery, and incest in a tenement? Is it the portrayal of drug-induced ecstasy, obviously real to the person on the trip, real enough to make him want to fly? One suspects that these topics and issues do not quite fit into the distinction between fantasy and realism present by implication in Arbuthnot.

The fault with the book lies in the fact that it is not a vehicle by which one is taught to see literature with his own eyes, as an adult first, and then as an adult who teachers children also. The book centers on the problems of the child, and not on the problems of the adult who is quite likely encountering literature himself for the first time at the college level. In a sense, the book is a series of what are probably quite well-intentioned lessons about what to do "for" the child in looking at the books which publishers put out by the droves each year. The focus is not upon the development of a critical method, either in the child or in the prospective teacher.

A critical sense, or means of understanding the deeper meanings implied by the structure inherent in literature, enables a teacher to evaluate and illuminate works in the classroom in a way which places the discussion on a plane of intellectual activity which is honest, rich, and important to the developing intellect of the child. That literature possesses larger meanings and significances than a mere appeal to merriment or mirth is the contribution the English professor can make.

One very clear area where such a contribution can be made would be in a demonstration of just how weak Arbuthnot's discussion of William Blake's Songs of Innocence and Experience really is. For such a demonstration, compare Arbuthnot on Blake with Harold Bloom on Songs of Innocence and Experience in Blake's Apocalypse.

William Blake, particularly the Blake of the Songs of Innocence and Experience, is important to me. He knocked me out of being a backwoods Southerner (if I was knocked out of it): "Prisons are built with stones of Law, Brothels with bricks of Religion;" "Every Harlot was a Virgin once;" "Prudence is a rich ugly old maid courted by Incapacity;"

> But most thro' midnight streets I hear
> How the youthful Harlot's curse
> Blasts the new-born Infant's tear,
> And blights with plagues the Marriage hearse.

There's power in that. But Arbuthnot merely tells us that in Songs of Innocence there are lambs; in Songs of Experience there are tigers. In Songs of Innocence there are chimney sweepers who wash in the river and laugh in the sun; in Songs of Experience there are others who don't. That's all Arbuthnot gives you. Recall "The Chimney Sweeper."

> When my mother died I was very young
> And my father sold me while yet my tongue,
> Could scarcely cry weep weep weep weep.
> So your chimneys I sweep and in soot I sleep.
>
> There's little Tom Dacre, who cried when his head
> That curl'd like a lambs back, was shav'd, so I said.
> Hush, Tom, never mind it, for when your head's bare,
> You know that the soot cannot spoil your white hair.

And so he was quiet, and that very night,
As Tom was a sleeping he had such a sight,
That thousands of sweepers Dick Joe Ned and Jack
Were all of them lock'd up in coffins of black.

And by came an Angel who had a bright key,
And he open'd the coffins and set them all free.
Then down a green plain leaping laughing they run
And wash in a river and shine in the Sun.

Then naked and white, all their bags left behind.
They rise upon clouds, and sport in the wind.
And the Angel told Tom if he'd be a good boy,
He'd have God for his father and never want joy.

And so Tom awoke and we rose in the dark
And got with our bags and our brushes to work.
Tho' the morning was cold, Tom was happy and warm,
So if all do their duty, they need not fear harm.

One can discover an immensely complicated irony in that poem, written as it was in 1789, amid the rising emotional fires of the French Revolution and by an English Redcap. We who live with the issues presented by the community representatives here may not be chimney sweepers but we still have chimney sweeper problems.

When I tried to do an honest job with kids and with such poems, I had a hell of a time learning how to teach. I thought all you had to do was tell someone something; I didn't know there was more to it than that. I got in this room with the kids, and it took me about two weeks this summer to get them to come around in a group. I couldn't just say, "Sit on the floor"; I knew enough to know that that wouldn't work. So I just let them raise hell for awhile, and finally we got together on the thing. I have several terrible flops with poems. I tried cute things like seating them in a circle; then I got a ted rose and said, "My love's like a red, red, rose that's newly sprung in June." That didn't work. They said, "Mr. Anderson, who are you engaged to?" They took it quite at the literal level. I watched some other teachers and I discovered that I had to chart the poem if I wanted them to look at the text of it, and put my charted poem on the board. That was lesson number one.

Lesson number two was that I had to do something that would involve the children and their own life experience with the life experience rendered in the poem. For example, when I was teaching Blake's, "To the Evening Star," I had to start with that moment we know in California when the sun drops down behind the beach; there is a lovely moment there on the beach, when a gull goes past just before it's dark, just when you're ready to go home; this balance between night and day is the metaphor of the poem. Once my teaching was started in this way, then the children could see the poem. But I had to do the relating.

But first I had to understand the poem. The poem, "Evening Star," is not about evening, it's about tranquility. I didn't just teach them poems like "To the Evening Star;" I went on to others -- "A Noiseless Patient Spider," "Learned Astronomer," "Stopping by a Woods on a Snowy Evening" (which was very hard to do on a hot day in California.) I had an even worse time when I got to the first poem that is in the Roberts series, (a state-adopted text in California). It's a poem about playing with building blocks, by Robert Louis Stevenson. None of my kids had ever played with blocks.

I had thirty Mexican-American children from the ghetto in the city of San Fernando; I had other sophisticated little sharpies who had spent all of their youth on surf boards or in a swimming pool. They had never played with blocks. It was impossible to relate that poem to anything that they knew, so we had to junk it. They associated staying in the house and playing with things with being sick, and so, therefore, didn't want to have anything to do with it. Perhaps other children who lived in colder places would know what it meant to stay inside and have to play with something.

I had the teachers there as I tried to learn to teach. The reason they wouldn't go with me on some of these literary ventures is the plain fact that they didn't know what I was talking about. I said, "All right, now, you've taught Peter Rabbit. It develops the same motif that many a fairy story and hero-adventure story develops. Someone leaves home, goes on a trip, confronts a dragon, a monster, or some obstacle or another, surmounts it in some way or other, and then comes home and is changed by his experience. Well, in this case, Peter Rabbit leaves the hole, he meets Mr. McGregor, he somehow or other gets out of that mess, and gets home." I said, "That's the same thing as Odysseus leaving Ithaca, bumping into Scylla and Charybdis, the Cyclops, the Sirens, Circe, all of these things, and then through his strength getting home again." Well, the Peter Rabbit side of things was fine; The Odyssey was less successful as I presented it to them. So I said, "All right; watch me do it then." Of course, this meant I taught elementary school all summer, which was a great delight. The students are far more receptive than most college freshmen are. In this, if you know the literature, you have a range to work in. As you get to something that you can plug in to support what you have done earlier, you're able to do it.

The teachers I was working with were very reluctant to admit that they did not know The Odyssey. I would mention The Odyssey, and there would be a polite look, and finally I'd say, "You don't know The Odyssey, do you?" "No, I really don't." Now that's the heart of the problem. There isn't that fund of literary knowledge and knowledge of the techniques of explication in the program that you can rely on if you want to do something to improve the way the literary teaching is done.

It must be remembered that the teacher who is not himself in the possession of a critical sense will accept at face value the authority of the text as presented him in the Children's Literature course. The teaching done from such a foundation of weakness as the presentation of Blake or Whitman or even Peter Rabbit in Arbuthnot or in conventional children's literature books will hardly be stronger in the elementary classroom.

Rather too often we forget the fact that the child's intellect at the age of seven probably is capable of quite sophisticated intellectual manipulation (even those that are appropriate to the study of poetry from an analytic point of view). I always encounter a great deal of opposition on this point. The general notion among elementary teachers is -- and I must insist that this experience has occurred too frequently for me to be able to dismiss it -- that an analysis of poetry spoils its aesthetic value. This is the single most disputed point between elementary teachers and college professors of English. In fact, the opposition is so strong to accepting the point of view that a certain amount of probing and questioning must occur before a complete cognition of a poem can take place, that one is tempted to retreat in self-defense. But my experiences with children in the Lincoln Public Schools, and in the NDEA Institute Demonstration School at San Fernando Valley State College this summer with teaching poems to children encourages me in the insistence that even second and third grade children are capable of understanding the most important points about very difficult poems (Blake's "The Tyger" and "To The Evening Star," Frost's "Stopping By Woods on a Snowy Evening,") and that their responses were only developed and expressed when the meaning of the metaphors was discussed, analyzed, talked about, and explored in quite intellectual fashions.

And the children did understand and retain the poems. I had several of them write about the poems after a few days had elapsed, and the hard evidence was there that the meaning of the poem had penetrated and had remained in the child's mind. Without explicating the poems myself, I could not have known which questions to ask. I assert that explication is an indispensable preparation for a teacher of literature. And I further assert that this is the proper and usual business of the professor of English. He does it all the time. A college professor of English probably does more explicating than any other human function. He just does not seem to do it yet in the direction of the elementary teacher.

To return to my war with the anti-explicationists, let me tell an anecdote about an experience which happened late at night, after all the guns were still, when some colleagues and I were talking during our Salt Lake City Conference in May. I got into a gray with one of them when I said, "You know, Madam X doesn't like what I said today very much, does she?" (I had said that Blake's "To the Evening Star" is a richer, and likely-better, poem than "Starlight, Starbright".) My friend flashed back, much to the defense of the Madam X's point of view, which was contrary to my own, by saying, "Of course she doesn't like what you said: She isn't interested in literary criticism, she's interested in human behavior."

Well, that hits at the heart of the thing. The English professor has almost completely neglected the human behavior which is represented in the elementary schools. He has kept his talents for accuracy of text, for complete respect for the integrity of the literary artist, for almost slavish devotion to the causes, greatnesses, and glories of literature, almost exclusively to himself. Now it is time for him to offer his values to the society in the form of training teachers for teaching literature to the young, and in so doing, he will doubtless open new gateways for his own experience. It has simply not occurred to most English professors, perhaps, that they can become involved in the future of the schools. And this is in the surest sense of the word tragic.

It will not be easy to change, either for the English professor to see his errors, or for the school people to accept him even if the does look repentant. As Paul Goodman tells us in Compulsory Mis-education and the Community of Scholars, we do have an educational system "proliferated into an invested intellectual class worse than anything since the time of Henry the Eighth." It will not be easy to change.

But Tri-University Project is certainly more than a beginning. The involvement of the academic professor with the question of teacher training for elementary schools is the signal of a new era for co-operation between academic subjects, and schools. It remains for us then, in English to:

1) Devise courses in explication and critical method which will reach the elementary trainee.

2) Devise courses in linguistics which will reach the elementary trainee.

3) Involve ourselves in teaching Children's Literature as a serious study.

4) Spread our knowledge by publishing in journals which reach elementary teachers.

5) Visit schools and answer the special demands of the elementary classroom which can be met only by college English courses.

And, finally we must set our own house of teaching in order. For, as Chaucer's Parson says of those who do not set a good example for others in their charge (and isn't the same thing true for teachers?):

That if gold ruste, what shal iren do?
For if a preest be foul, on whom we truste,
No wonder is a lewed man to ruste.
And shame it is, if a preest take keep.
A shiten shepherd and a clene sheep.

A RESPONSE FROM A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Associate Commissioner Don Davies

We Have Met the Enemy

Associate Commissioner
Don Davies

The speech which follows was given by Associate Commissioner Don Davies at the end of the first day of discussion. Mr. Davies is the former head of TEPS and presently heads the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development in whose charge the education of teachers and of all "educational personnel" in the United States is placed. Mr. Davies, if his bureau receives support from the Congress, is in a position to encourage whatever sorts of changes can be "encouraged" from the top. Mr. Davies took positions in response to what he had heard at the conference. The positions which he took are clear, and his candor speaks for itself.

We Have Met the Enemy

Don Davies
U. S. Office of Education

I thought today was extraordinary and remarkable in many ways. For those of us who are part of the education establishment and who play a large part in controlling what happens, (and that includes all of you or most of you in the audience and myself), it was very painful to hear again and again and again a record of our failures. It is a very painful thing for all of us to know that our education establishment is failing in important, significant and undeniable ways despite our successes and our statistics and all of the other things that we used to point to with pride.

One of the remarkable things about today was the level of communication. I thought it was really much better than it is in most conferences that I attend. I don't know whether you felt this or not, but I felt that there was communication. I felt people getting mad; I felt people getting upset. They were mad and upset with themselves; they were mad and upset with the speakers; they were mad and upset with the system or with something. I felt that people with whom I was sharing were getting as confused as I was, groping with such questions as "Well who's responsible? What can we do about it?" I think that this level of communication is very exciting and very useful and I wish there were ways in which we could get this kind of communication into those endless conferences and meetings that we have in our education business, because we seldom reach it. And I hope that I can communicate half as well in the next few minutes as most of the people did during the day.

We have a very important new opportunity to bring about a badly needed change in American education by trying to do something about the ways in which we recruit and train teachers and other kinds of educational personnel. My job at the Office of Education is to head up the program that represents this new opportunity. Last summer, Congress passed something called The Education Professions Development Act, which brought together some existing programs of teacher training, like the Teacher Corps and the institute programs, and added some new things to it. The really important thing was that when Congress passed the bill that the Administration supported, the Office of Education took over and the field responded. There was for the first time in years, perhaps ever, a recognition by the important parts of the establishment of American education that you really can't do anything to change schools or colleges unless you change people; it's just as simple as that. We've always known that. To build new buildings, to send more Title I money into poverty areas, to buy new equipment for kids and for teachers, to develop new curriculum -- to do all of these things is just great, but they don't add up to anything unless you change people -- teachers, and administrators, and the people who run the system. And that's what this Education Professions Development Act is designed to do.

We have an opportunity with a limited amount of money, but still a very substantial amount of money, to try to do something about some of these things. So far there's very strong support for this new program. The new program will create opportunities to provide schools and colleges with money fellowships and institutes of various kinds, and other types of training programs for all kinds of educational personnel. All fields, all subject matters, all levels from infant programs to the graduate school will be included in the scheme. For the first time, there are no categories which limit the federal assistance for training; for the first time, schools themselves are eligible applicants and are invited into this act; for the first time, we have authorization and funds to support programs to prepare teachers' aides and other kinds of auxiliary personnel for the schools.

As a part of this program this summer, because of this new opportunity, under one of the sections of the legislation at least, we received about three thousand proposals from schools and colleges around the United States, which is an enormous number of proposals. The people in the office have added up the price tag on all of these proposals and it's a billion dollars, which is a lot of money. Of course we don't have a billion dollars. Congress, when they do finally pass an appropriation bill sometime, will have something like ninety-five million dollars to respond to that one billion dollar's worth of requests. With that ninety-five million dollars, schools and colleges will get busy on both new and effective programs to train teacher aides, teachers, administrators and other kinds of specialists.

After we've spent that ninety-five million dollars in 1968-69, and then another hundred or so million dollars the next year, and the next year, and the next year, so that we're gradually talking about hundreds of millions and then billions of dollars, and after you've gotten all of your projects, what really worries me is whether American education will be any different from what it is today. If it isn't, I really think that I will have done a great disservice to American education, and so will you. I think that unless you and the Office of Education spend this money in ways that will contribute to vastly different, vastly improved and vastly more effective educational programs for kids at all levels, we really are going to be misleading the taxpayers and wasting a good deal of money. I'm happy to say that publicly to Congress or to anybody else. It's what I believe about this program.

After I've said that, though, I would add just one footnote: even though we're going to be spending a good deal of money, federal money, it will still be only a drop in the bucket compared with what's really needed to do the job. It will really only be money to get some things started, to light some fires, to do some prodding, to do some stimulation, to make it possible for some good people to do some things they might not be able to do otherwise. It will really, though, be the job of the schools, the colleges, the universities and the people who support them, to change American education if it's going to get done.

I've spent a lot of time in the last seven or eight years, traveling around the country talking to teachers, visiting schools, visiting classrooms, reading things and watching my own children go through school, and I'm increasingly convinced that American education's biggest problem is one that we very seldom talk about. It is that it is too often an agonizing bore for too many children and a frustrating trial for too many teachers. All too often, American classrooms are dull and lifeless and anti-intellectual places. Dick Foster said it his way. He said that students sit through seemingly endless hours enduring an experience that seems irrelevant to their real lives and concerns, and they feel powerless to do anything about it. Foster is talking, and I'm talking, about white kids and black kids and Indian children, Mexican-American children, all kinds of children in affluent schools and poverty schools.

A few days ago, Jerrold Zacharias came to the Office of Education to consult with us about teacher education and how we ought to use the funds that we have to use in the next year. In the course of this meeting, I got inside and asked him if he would give me his honest opinion about the fact that the most important thing we could do in this new Bureau of Educational Personnel Development in the Office of Education. What ought the priority to be? I was expecting from this great scientist and learned educator a rather long, elegant, and scholarly sort of response, but it was very short; here it is verbatim: "Get teachers to start teaching kids like human beings." It seems to me that that remark says a lot about the problems of racism, the problems of poverty, and the problems of kids in the affluent school that my kids go to in suburban Washington.

This means really that schools need to become developers of people rather than sorters and testers and discarders of people. This means also that teachers and administrators and specialists in education, schools and colleges, must begin to change their expectations of kids. They must begin to develop the expectation that youngsters, regardless of whether they're black, brown, red, or whatever, can learn and will learn, and that it is the responsibility of the school and the teacher to make sure that they do learn; it is no good finding all sorts of excuses in the family or the kid or the home or the community when the teacher and the school cannot help them to learn. Now it's that expectation that seems to me to be central to our problem of developing the kind of school and the kind of teaching and administrative force that we need.

Now what can we do? Well, the Office of Education can do a great deal because we will encourage certain kinds of practices (according to the way we invest our money). By what we say in guidelines, we will encourage certain kinds of practices. Sometimes what we encourage will be phoney, just so that the guidelines will have been met. Other times it won't.

I'd like to give you just four or five things that seem to me to be important as I'm looking toward the next two or three years in this program. These are the things for which I would like to use my influence, whatever influence I have; these are the things on which I would like to exercise my leadership in this new program in the Office of Education; they are things that should be reflected in what the schools and colleges do to try to develop educational personnel.

The first of these things has to do with the people in charge of developing programs for training. I would say that it's very important that both schools and colleges be involved in assessing the need, planning the program and conducting it on a basis of parity and equal partnership. Now that's a very easy and simple thing to say, except that we know that it does not happen. We're just beginning to learn how to do that, and this kind of program that you people are involved in, is one important step in that direction. It is essential that school people, teachers, and college people should learn to talk to each other, work together, plan programs together and learn about education together.

Second, I think we ought to find a variety of new and genuine ways to involve students, college students, in identifying the needs, and planning and conducting programs of teacher education. Most undergraduate institutions that prepare teachers have not even begun to listen to the students or given them any part in telling us what we ought to do with all of these new federal funds to improve the preparation of teachers.

Third, I think we ought to involve teachers. It sounds so simple, but those of you who are teachers, administrators and college professors know that teachers usually find out about the proposal that has been funded by the Office of Education after it's funded and after the program is about ready to start. How many programs do you know in the school districts in which you work in which teachers have had a genuine involvement in developing the idea of the proposal and the program, identifying the need and talking about what ought to be done about it? I don't know of very many, and yet it's the simplest idea possible if we want to get a successful and relevant and effective program. I think we ought to start insisting that training programs coming from schools and colleges involve teachers in their development and conduct.

Fourth, I think we ought to involve the community, as we've been hearing today. I think that what the gentleman from Woodlawn said about the proposal from the University of Chicago was exactly what I would have said if I had been in his shoes, if a proposal was developed to do something to me, about me, in which I had absolutely no knowledge and no share. I don't think that's right. We need to include the community in important ways in this mix that we're talking about, and to learn from them.

Finally, we most certainly need to include both the academic people and the education people in this mix, because both have something to contribute; and of course this is another place where a project such as Tri-University has something special to offer. So we have the potential here of an exciting mix: we have scholars and practitioners; we have teachers and parents and students and citizens; we have school people and college people; we have teachers and we have professors; all of these people identifying problems, planning effective training programs, carrying those programs out. I think that we should move the Office of Education and the schools and colleges of this country to insist that the programs that we plan and fund have these characteristics, that they have this mix. And I don't think we ought to wait another decade to do that.

The next point is a kind of guideline for me and always has been; it's a very simple idea. In the training programs, we need much heavier emphasis on experience, direct experience if you will, on being where kids are and where their parents are, being in schools and classrooms and in communities. You all know this. We've been saying it for ages. It's in every book about teacher education. Every time we ask students or beginning teachers or experienced teachers what they want, the answer is, "We want more experience." Well isn't it about time that we ourselves insist on giving them more experience, so that what they learn is more effective and they can do something with it, instead of just continuing to talk about it. On that score I have a private view that all teachers wherever they're prepared, for whatever kinds of schools they're being prepared, ought to be prepared to deal effectively by attitude and skill and knowledge with all kinds of children whether they're physically handicapped or not, whether they're white, black, or any other color. We can't predict where everyone's going to go and teach, and they're not all going to teach in ghetto schools. I don't think that is the point. I think it's as important for the person who's going to teach my kid's school in Montgomery County to have that kind of background and feeling and experience as for the young teacher who's going to downtown Washington.

Another idea that I'd like to share with you is that we need to emphasize programs that open up new kinds of career opportunities for people of all kinds in training. We need to emphasize new kinds of programs that open up new opportunities for people to work in schools. I'm talking about different kinds of people here. One obvious target is programs to open up careers in education for poor people and people in all the various minority groups who are not represented very well in schools. The kinds of programs that I'm most interested in are programs that provide a kind of a ladder for people where they can start by being teacher aides or technicians and then climb if they want to be teachers, to be principals, to be superintendents, or to come and work at the Office of Education. I think we need to provide new kinds of career opportunities in education for other kinds of people who are not coming to us in great numbers. Talented liberal arts college graduates who go into other fields who might be interested in coming into teaching, adults in communities, scientists, artists, craftsmen, all kinds of people who have something to offer, should be at least given the opportunity to teach. We can open up some of the kinds of career opportunities in schools by new programs of recruitment and training.

A lot more could be said about that, but I'll move on rather quickly to another thing that seems to me to be of special importance if we're really going to do anything about changing people. If you accept my earlier assumption, you accept that as the target. Training programs, if they're going to do anything about people, must deal with the cognitive side of human behavior, of course; with knowledge, techniques, and skills. But they must also deal with the feeling and attitudinal side of life or they simply will not affect the people. If you're trying to do something about this problem of expectations, about what poor youngsters can learn, you can't do it just by teaching teachers and administrators facts. This is an affective problem, an attitudinal problem. We need to develop, then, in every training program ways to influence the people being trained to feel other's values and attitudes and, hence, imagine their way into the world which informs their behavior. Otherwise they're not going to be effective training programs.

Finally, high on the list of my guidelines for this new program would be programs that are designed to bring about lasting changes in the institutions in which teachers and administrators work and are trained, specifically schools and colleges. Here I'm talking about our tendency in education and in federal programs and in foundations to have a whole series of projects year after year which change, which are very interesting and very nice, which involve lots of people, but which fade away so that not even the shadow is left when the outside money is removed. So I'm interested, as I know you are, in trying to encourage programs that will make some lasting difference in the institution so that year after year we don't have to spend money on remedial programs, because the institution has built into itself the capacity for the continuing development of its personnel.

Now to the extent that the Tri-University Project meets these kinds of criteria, I hope that we will be funding in the years ahead a great many other projects like this one with this spirit, the spirit of college-university-school cooperation, the spirit of teacher-professor dialogue, the spirit of the involvement of the community, the school, the college. This kind of spirit is worth encouraging and giving visibility to.

But before I leave you to your own program, the thing you're most interested in right now, the one thought that I had today as I talked to some of you and listened to what was going on, was that since this is a very expensive program and one of the biggest, most important things we have going, costing a lot of money (I always think about the taxpayers' money; so do you), it is very important that all of this makes some difference to you after you get back to wherever you are going to go; you are being invested in, really, because you are a gatekeeper, or someone who might be a mover and a shaker, someone who might get something done when you leave the interesting and valuable experience you're going to have at N.Y.U. or at Nebraska or at the University of Washington. That is the reason the investment is being made in you. If you don't do that, the investment will not have been wisely made, even though you have a very happy and pleasant experience, wherever you go.

Before I stop, I want to leave you with one quote that I brought along in my briefcase from Washington, which summarized what I was trying to communicate to you earlier about what the problem is in education and what I hope our new efforts in the Education Professions Development Act can do something about. This is from a book that some of you probably missed because it's not an education book. It's called I Passed As A Teenager, and was written by a writer who really wanted to write a kind of a popular bestseller about teenagers; she spent some time in an urban high school. The story is not as funny or happy as the one which she set out to write. She had a kind of a lighthearted spirit about the thing. She was a fairly young gal. She went into a high school, passed as a sixteen-and-a-half-year-old girl for a very long period of time, fooled all the teachers, administrators, doctors, and everybody else. So she was viewing the process as an adult and also as a sixteen-and-a-half-year-old teenager; she concludes by contrasting her feelings as an adult with the feelings that she had posing as a sixteen-and-a-half-year-old. I think what she says has a feeling behind it that's important if you're concerned about change in education.

"I am potent as an adult. I can make myself felt. I can hold up my hand and say 'wait a minute.' I can say 'no, I won't,' and 'yes, I can.' I can say 'this is me.' 'I am a person.' 'These are my limitations,' 'these are my potentialities.' You may not like me but that doesn't mean I have to change. I don't have to submit. I don't have to repress. I can pack and go, or better yet I can suggest that you pack and go. But I have seen their special world [talking about the teenagers] and let me tell you that I am not worried about the musical interests of today's teenagers. I am worried about the kinds of teachers they're exposed to and the kinds of environment they go into when they leave home in the morning.

"Now I didn't go to urban high school looking for this worry. I didn't go to a high school to learn about high school. I went there because that's where the kids were. I didn't want to get involved in the problems of education, but I got involved. Now I can't forget the anger and exhaustion that I felt at the end of each of my days. This is what I felt: stop threatening me! That's what I wanted to shout in my classrooms. If you don't cover your book by Wednesday, if you don't have your homework written on lined paper, if you don't bring your dollar for student government, if you don't keep quiet, if you don't, if you don't start, if you don't stop, you'll be punished, you'll be punished. Good God, there must be some other way."

And all right, I think we know that there are other ways, and it's those other ways that I think we need to seek together. But as you ponder about why American education is so slow to change, I would remind you of just one little piece of philosophy that comes from a philosopher that may be a favorite of yours -- Pogo. Pogo said one time not too long ago, "We have met the enemy, and he is us."

COUNTERRESPONSE FROM THE COMMUNITY GROUP

Counterresponse From The Community Group

On the second day of the conference, the committee of Community Representatives was encouraged, by the representatives of the Tri-University Project who organized the conference and by the representatives of CONPASS who were present at the meeting, to meet in closed session to discuss whatever matters of mutual interest they might wish to discuss. The hope of the Tri-University Project was that the group of Community Representatives would become a group consultative to the project as regards its later directions -- insofar as these directions might relate to the cultures and communities with which the Graveses, Gibbses, Drakes, and so forth identify. This meeting resulted in the presentation by the "community people" of a series of resolutions offered "for support or rejection" by the conference. One senses that the resolutions in part grew out of a sense on the part of the "Community Representatives" that the people from Higher Education and the schools with whom they had been talking were being polite to them, offering nominal agreement and nominal sympathy, and somehow, thus in their imaginations transforming the Community Representatives from "people" -- with whom they had to deal -- into symbols of their own flexibility and liberalism with which they did not have to deal. In any case, a confrontation occurred.

The resolutions were presented.

The matter of "non-discussion" was discussed.

The Community Representatives left the room to allow the people from higher education and the schools to reach a position.

The people from Higher Education and the schools came, after some agonizing, to give substantial support to ten of the eleven community resolutions.

In the section which follows, we reproduce the resolutions of the community representatives, the discussions between people in Higher Education and the schools and the Community Representatives, and a summary of the later discussion, in the letter to Commissioner Davies which ends the section. The beginning of the discussion is included as a sample of the kind of confrontation, the kind of rage, which is likely to come out in meetings between "community" and academic people; the end of the discussion is not reproduced verbatim because, after the Community Representatives left, the discussion came to be largely procedural and all major differences between the consensus of the conference and that of the community people are represented in the letter to Don Davies.

A. RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE TRI-UNIVERSITY CONFERENCE ON ELEMENTARY EDUCATION MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA, 9-20-68

From the common bond of alienation of poverty, educational or societal, regardless of race, color, or geographic location, the undersigned, having been defined by the Tri-University Conference as being "Community Experts," respectfully present the following resolutions for support or rejection, but not for discussion, by the members and officials of this Conference.

TO THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION:

1. As of now, no Office of Education funding should be made in the specific geographic area of residence of the "Community Experts" here represented without their prior consultation.

2. The "Community Experts" here present should be brought together by the Office of Education to help develop on a national level groups similar to themselves.

3. As of now and in the future, no Office of Education funds should be given to universities to study the poor, the alienated, or the powerless of this country. Funds rather should be directed towards the problems of racism and ethnocentrism in education. This must be done in consultation with the people mentioned in No. 2 above.

4. No Office of Education funds shall be released to public or private schools for the "retraining" of teachers until Nos. 1 and 2 above are accomplished.

5. All federal education programs dealing with minority groups in America should be subject to the approval of the Office of Education and the community involved; such as, Navajo education programs should be approved by the Navajo Board of Directors and the school boards in the local communities.

6. An incentive bonus to teachers, funded through the Office of Education, should be payed those teachers who work in economically depressed areas, provided that the community, as described in Nos. 1 and 2 above, has the right of hiring and firing.

TO SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES OF EDUCATION:

7. We call on the School or College of Education of each sponsoring institution in the Tri-University Conference to actively support these resolutions. We further request from the staff of the Conference reports as to progress on them from time to time.

TO TRI-UNIVERSITY PARTICIPANTS:

8. Future Tri-University conferences should not be organized without planning that includes representatives of the "Community Experts" here assembled.

9. At the next Conference, the "Community Experts" listed below should be brought back for the purpose of assessment of the impact of these resolutions and this meeting on our individual communities, and on the sponsoring institutions of the Conference.

10. It is insulting to us as "Community Experts" to participate in a conference and be submitted to the colonial and paternalistic attitudes and responses of speakers such as Dean Griffiths of New York University. We recommend that this attitude be condemned by the assembly and avoided at future meetings of the Tri-University Conference.

11. These resolutions, whether or not approved by the Conference, should be made part of the official records which are normally submitted to the Office of Education.

Respectfully submitted,

California
James Drake, Delano

Illinois
Armin Beck, Chicago
Louise Bufford, Chicago
Anthony Gibbs, Chicago

Kentucky
Sue Easterling, Pikeville
Zi Graves, Bloss

Louisiana
Ernest Morial, New Orleans

Nebraska
Ernest Chambers, Omaha
Dan Goodwin, Omaha

New Mexico
Robert Norris, Ft. Wingate

New York
Stephen Merli, New York

B. DISCUSSION OF THE RESOLUTIONS PRIOR TO THE LEAVING OF THE COMMUNITY GROUP

Mr. Olson: I'm going to ask Mr. Gibbs to chair this meeting. I notice that "Resolutions" of the community representatives says in the beginning section that the Community Committee is asking that there will not be discussion of the resolutions. I think that's appropriate; however, what I would like to have would be discussion among the community people if Mr. Gibbs is willing to have that of the meaning of the resolutions that are presented here so that we know what we are voting for. Vote your honest convictions. If you don't think that the community resolutions make sense, don't be sentimental and vote for them. If you think they do make sense, that they represent desirable change, don't vote out of fear and vote against them.

Mr. Gibbs: At this meeting this afternoon we discussed the issue of whether these resolutions should be debated; we feel that we came here out of sincere interest because of our own particular problems in our own particular communities. These two days represent a terrific amount that we're giving up in our areas to come here, when we could be back doing the job that's a twenty-four-hour-a-day job -- that's how far behind things are.

The multiracial community represented here has come to a decision concerning the area not for discussion. We feel that we have discussed these resolutions with you for the last two days in all the talks that have been given by the representatives of the communities; I don't know if you were listening or not, but we covered almost every one of these things. I think the discussion culminated with Bob Norris's last statement. He described why things weren't working.

This is our position on the issue.

Paul Olson has an alternative to offer to this body; we will clarify any questions you might have concerning these resolutions, but I do want it understood that we will not debate on them. We will only clarify where there is a question.

Mr. Olson: I think partly what's good about this meeting is that one doesn't know what is going to happen. Some of the people in the audience asked me if we might have discussions. I then spoke with the community representatives concerning the possibility of discussions. They said the issues are clear: "We've discussed them for a couple of days; it is not a question of the issue, but a question of understanding the language or understanding what they mean." If you wish to ask questions, or if you wish clarification, the community people said they would be willing to do this. Now it seems to me if that's agreeable to you, then we can go ahead and vote or not vote. If this isn't agreeable, then we will include these recommendations in the record as the recommendations of the community group to the Tri-University Project and to the Office of Education, and I guess the only way in which we can test whether they've been taken cognizance of is to watch our deeds. I suppose votes don't mean very much if our deeds don't show some response. Is there objection to bringing this to the group, giving five minutes to each point for clarification, then voting on it?

Participant: I want to object to that. I favor no vote.

Mr. Norris: The purpose of this paper is to ask you people to support us. The U.S. Office of Education can reject it, reject every one of these. But all we're asking here is just a chance for a sounding board from you people. Has this helped clarify anything?

Participant: No, I don't think it does at all. The very language of the "Resolutions" paper is arrogant. To say that there will be no discussion, and to say that we will interpret the language of it, defeats the essence of the democratic tradition. If you're unwilling to discuss, if you want to say, "Well we had discussion on these issues," I think this is subterfuge. On the other hand, no one had any knowledge that a set of propositions would be offered to be discussed or to be debated. I think if you're going to expect fair play, that you should have given advance notice that such a set of propositions would be advanced and put on an agenda before any discussion, so that counter-motions could be offered. I think to even continue to have the language here in the first paragraph, "to support or to reject it, but not for discussion," is unacceptable.

Mr. Chambers: My friend, you're entitled to your opinion; but just like you feel the language of this particular position paper is arrogant, you are not in a position to speak for the entire assembly, so yours is only one man's opinion. And I think what all of you should understand in making your determination is that this conference group is a powerless group, as a group. The people from the communities did give up time and other things that are more meaningful in trying to handle our particular problems, in coming here. So if you don't go for this position, all you're saying is that there's no point in having community people come to these meetings, because you have a certain style of conversation you want to have, and if anybody does not come into that particular line then it's "arrogance," i.e. community people don't have the right to speak this particular way. So in order not to get into a long discussion, and violate the ground rules that we have agreed on among ourselves, I think that if anything is going to be voted on or not, it is the question of whether there is to be a vote at all.

Mr. Olson: So far as the rules of the discussion are concerned, I'm completely responsible. And if I fouled up, I fouled up. It would seem to me that the appropriate thing to do would be to get the sense of the meeting as to whether you wish to vote on these resolutions or not. I'm going to ask the house to indicate whether or not it wishes to vote after five minutes of clarifying discussion on each of these. I'm going to do that without discussion, because it seems to me it's not a discussible matter at this point in the agenda. All those who are in favor of five minutes of clarifying discussion on each of these resolutions and a vote, say "Aye." All those opposed say "No."

Participant: Point of order. Please, may I ask a question? Does "clarifying discussion" mean interchange and possibly change, or does it mean only explanation of the article?

Mr. Olson: I would think "clarifying discussion" would mean only explanation of questions with respect to the intentions of the writers of these resolutions -- questions as to their meaning. If in the process of their doing this clarifying, they see that there is an ambiguity which they wish to change, it would seem to me that that's their decision. I have no clear sense of where the "ayes" and the "nays" are at this point.

Participant: I still have a point of order. Are we going to vote then, Resolution One, aye and nay, Resolution Two, aye and nay; or are we going to vote on all ten with a single yes and no?

Mr. Olson: We'll vote individually on them. I would be much opposed, given my sense of democratic procedure, to your having to accept this whole kettle of fish without discriminating among the points.

Mr. Chambers: Correction here. Here's what none of you seem to understand: we don't have to be at these meetings. You can't function without the community; you can keep stumbling around like you have, but you can see you're losing control of schools in every community. You have the opportunity to work with people in the community.

See, whether you like this or not, we can take every school in the community; we can make conditions in those schools so intolerable that you cannot come there, that you will not come there, and if you do come you won't do anything anyway. And you know what would bring about a situation like that? A showing by you of an unwillingness to accept what the community says ought to happen in that particular community. Now, if you don't like what goes on in that community, you don't have to teach there. So we have agreed that this -- you can call it a position paper if you choose -- that it's the whole thing or nothing at all. We cannot compromise. If you have principles and scruples against what's in here, you should not compromise.

So here's what I'm going to say, because I'm speaking for us -- Mr. Olson is somewhat on the spot because he's got to be the referee among all the different elements in this conference -- we should have the people who feel that there should be a clarification of five minutes on each point, and then a vote, stand at this time. That's it. Then after they stand, those who don't feel that there should be a vote taken under these circumstances, they should stand. Whatever the larger number determines, that larger number's will will prevail. I think that's clear. That's the position we take.

Participant: Point of order.

Mr. Olson: Okay, point of order.

Participant: I though we were going to decide whether we were going to vote on this or not vote at all first.

Mr. Olson: This is what's being determined right now.

Participant: You asked us to vote whether we wanted to discuss it or not.

Mr. Olson: No, that's not what I'm asking.

Participant: Well, there are two parts to your question. If you separate them it would help. Or whether you want to vote at all. And then the matter of the five minutes is another matter.

Participant: If we vote that we want to vote on it, then we discuss it.

Mr. Olson: You mean whether we want to vote in any way, shape or form.

Participant: Yes.

Mr. Olson: The first question is should there be some sort of vote concerning these resolutions. All those who are in favor of some sort of vote concerning these resolutions, will you please stand.

Participant: It's not clear. It's not clear what you mean. What do you mean by "some sort of vote?"

Mr. Olson: That there be a vote. Now, the conditions of discussion and so forth in relationship to the vote, I'll have to pose after this. I think we have a majority in favor of a vote. Would those who are opposed to a vote stand? I'm sorry, maybe I've been unfair here. Let me make sure.

Participant: This may be -- the point may be out of order, but there are implications whether or not we should vote that have not been discussed, and I think these implications should be aired, if only very briefly.

Mr. Olson: I think those implications will come out in the question of whether we can establish a viable procedure in relationship to voting, and if we can't establish a viable procedure, we can't vote anyway. I don't want to get so hung up on procedure that we prove to the community people that everything they think about academic types is true. If I see that coming out in the discussion of the procedure for voting is some thing which requires us to go back to the issue of whether we should vote or not, I'll do that. What I would like to suggest, and I would like you to discuss this for a very few minutes, is the question of whether you're willing on both sides to vote on these points individually -- that is, one at a time, and with five minutes of clarifying discussion with respect to the resolutions.

Mr. Chambers: No, wait. You know what? There is so much difficulty here in arriving at an understanding even of what the question is that this establishes beyond the shadow of a doubt that there is so much fear in the academic community that they cannot understand English when they hear it spoken. It's not difficult to understand what has been said, and we know what your position is. That was the purpose of the voting, to establish in the traditional manner that you understand what your position is. You've shown it to me; you've shown it to all the other community people' so we are not going to go through all of this trouble and procedure.

We had a meeting, we made our agreements; you have your meetings, you make your agreements, you don't care what anyone says, you're going through with it. So it's going to be, no matter how you vote, the entire thing as it stands. If you need clarification of the language, like an "and" rather than a comma, maybe something like that which would clarify from a grammatical point of view what is actually stated; there will not be discussion for the purpose of changing the sentiment of one single statement here. And, since you're not going to vote, we still want to submit it into the record. Now if anything I've said is contrary to what the community people feel, then they'll express it at this time. But for my part, I don't see any need to discuss anything.

Participant: We have voted to vote.

Mr. Chambers: I understand this. The rest of you pretend not to understand, and this man is going to continue to let them dilly-dally. Either they're going to do it or they're not. It's as simple as that.

Mr. Olson: Are you saying that we cannot vote on the resolutions individually?

Mr. Gibbs: Right.

Miss Easterling: Right.

Mr. Gibbs: Right.

Mr. Olson: Okay. Is this a unanimous position of the community group?

Mr. Gibbs: Yes. We've already decided that.

Participant: Is a motion in order?

Mr. Olson: I think what we have is an indication from the community group that it would not be meaningful to them for us to follow a procedure in which we voted on these resolutions one at a time. Therefore it seems to me that there's only one procedure open to us, and that's to have forty-five minutes of discussion and to vote on them all at once. What I would like to suggest is that we have that as a procedure. I would like to have an indication from the house if that's an acceptable procedure. If it's not, then I don't think we'll have a vote.

Participant: I'd like to ask whether Mr. Chambers has the concensus of his whole group that we have to vote on the whole package.

Mr. Gibbs: Let me answer that . . .

Participant: Let me finish my question. Or whether we may vote on each item separately.

Mr. Gibbs: Now our position is this: there's no sense in employing the traditional means in the academic community, in the political community, when the minority sits, there is no sense in saying, "Is there unity among the individuals involved?" We decided that this afternoon ourselves among ourselves. We came to this body in good faith.

We are not going to create a discussion among ourselves up here for the next hour about a point we decided this afternoon. And we're not going to allow the individuals in this conference in any way to deal with us on this basis. We have decided, and we have given you the ground rules on which we want this thing dealt with. If you don't feel that you want to deal with it that way, then it's your responsibility as individuals to vote it down.

Mr. Olson: I think that's clear.

Participant: This is different from what we voted on a little while ago. The motion was 'some kind of vote'; they did not tell us. . . .

Mr. Olson: I said the next step was discussion of procedure. You can vote exactly opposite now. The fact of your voting one way on the first vote -- the vote about voting doesn't commit you to vote in favor of voting as procedure has been defined by the community people. I looked across the community people when I asked whether they wanted all resolutions voted at once or wanted them voted individually; I didn't see any heads shaking in a fashion that would suggest that Mr. Gibbs wasn't telling it like it is with respect to the sentiment of his group.

Participant: Mr. Chairman, I think something that might worry a few of my colleagues around the room looking at this; first of all, where were these people classified as "community experts"? I understand they're community representatives. Was there an election held in their communities to declare them experts?

Mr. Olson: Let me try to clarify what the position of a conference is, with respect to the Office of Education.

I think Mr. Chambers' description of the function of a conference is a precise description; a conference is advisory to the Office, it does not make policy. The commitment of the whole conference in support of these resolutions would not in any way coerce the Office of Education; what it might do would be to touch its conscience, or to give it some sense of what at least one group of people has to say.

On the other hand, the title "community expert" is a title which this group has assumed to itself; it wasn't a title which I gave it. However, it strikes me that -- given what I've heard from at least a number of the participants in this group, as to what they've learned about America's communities from the community people who are here -- the title is not entirely inappropriate.

Participant: I have to just have another point of information then; if I stretch myself as far as I can, I think I will be able to vote positively. I come from a two-man education department; I can't possibly commit myself to point number seven. If you ask me to support everything you say, I cannot commit in conscience my colleague to stand for my position without his having had the same sorts of experiences that I had the last two days.

Mr. Olson: I should ask Mr. Gibbs to clarify, but just let me state once again as the chairman of the conference what the function of a conference is. The function of a conference is that a group of people informally organized should call on other groups to do certain kinds of things. You're acting here as a member of a conference; you're not commiting your institution to respond to the conference. I come from a six-hundred man institution; obviously I can't deliver the University of Nebraska. Ernie Chambers knows that. But I can, as a man of conviction, if I vote for these resolutions, make an effort. You can perhaps deliver that other man in your department; perhaps you can't. But you're not committing your institution to this position.

Participant: Is a motion in order?

Mr. Chambers: Bring it to a point; let him make one.

Mr. Olson: Okay.

Participant: I would like to move that item eleven be accepted, and the other ten items be rejected.

Mr. Olson: Do we have a second?

Mr. Chambers: Just a minute.

Mr. Gibbs: [to Chambers] Don't debate him.

Mr. Olson: I think that your 'motion' actually doesn't constitute a motion, because I would accept the sense of motion 11 as chairman of the conference and would automatically see to it that these resolutions were included as part of the record.

Participant: Then I move that all eleven items be rejected.

Mr. Olson: That's clear, isn't it, Ernie?

Mr. Chambers: This is fine, because here's what we want to do, and this is the only clarification I'm going to give.

We want our position in the record; we're not going to have number 11 voted on as if we were voting on the real issues which are of concern to us now (Resolutions 1-10). That eleventh point cannot be voted on.

I think that this man's motion puts it right on the table so that all of you can understand, and we're right back where we were in the first place. Now; he made the motion. Did somebody second it?

Because at this point Mr. Gibbs becomes the chairman again. This man (Olson) was chairman just of this part of the confusion.

Mr. Olson: That's right.

Mr. Chambers: Now I believe Mr. Gibbs should resume the chairmanship. If he decides to entertain this motion, then go ahead and second it and vote on the thing. You know why it's like this? Because we've been dragging and dragging, and we're right back where we started from.

Mr. Olson: Do we have a second for the motion?

Mr. Chambers: Does the motion die for want of a second?

Mr. Olson: The motion apparently dies for want of a second. Now I want to put before the house a procedure. I'd like to have forty-five minutes of discussion, and then a vote at the end with respect to the total eleven points. Will all those who are in favor stand? That constitutes a majority; I turn the meeting over to Mr. Gibbs for forty-five minutes of clarifying discussion concerning the eleven points, and then we'll vote on the total eleven points in one vote.

Mr. Gibbs: Yes. This lady right here.

Participant: I'd like to make a comment.

Mr. Gibbs: If it's concerning the points we're getting ready to discuss, I'll entertain hearing it. If it's not, we'll move on.

Participant: I think that you have now defeated your whole purpose by making us buy the whole package, simply because -- let me just finish my sentence -- we listened to you . . . .

Mr. Gibbs: But you are out of order, madam. We have just decided that.

Participant: But let me finish. I'm going to finish this; we let you do it. And I'm going to be brief. I was ready to support about ninety per cent of this, which means that I am with you. There are some items in here I cannot support. You have now made it necessary for me individually to reject all of them, and I think that I'm speaking for a lot of people. . . .

Mr. Gibbs: Okay. All right, you've had your say. [The group then begins to look at the resolutions in order; Resolution One reads: "As of now, no Office of Education funding should be made in the specific geographic area of the 'Community Experts' without their prior consultation."]

Participant: My question is on item one; I guess we're going through these.

Mr. Gibbs: Yes. We start with Resolution I; that's the way you start.

Participant: The word "their" in the latter part of Resolution I; "without their prior consultation": are you referring to the specific people named here, or are you referring to the generalization, "people who are in those communities ought to be asked?" Are you saying that you're not perpetuating yourselves as the group, but people like you from your communities, or do you as specific community experts have to be consulted? That's all I'm asking.

Mr. Gibbs: We represent our communities.

Participant: Forever?

Mr. Gibbs: Life is not eternal itself.

Participant: Then you do mean you people as specific individuals in number one?

Mr. Gibbs: Correct.

Mr. Norris: We said with additions, with other people. If we want other people, then we will bring in other people.

Mr. Gibbs: Certainly. But that represents still "our constituency."

Participant: But couldn't you change the wording so that we would know that?

Mr. Chambers: The whole purpose of this is to make sure that something is done with a group of identifiable community people who can check to see how this sort of thing operates. And point number two says that this group will help to develop on a national level groups similar to this. This means that there have to be additional people like our group. How can these few people claim to represent all the communities in the country?

Participant: But Mr. Chambers, that's all I'm saying.

Mr. Gibbs: All right. Okay. With the clarification, which we said we would stay and discuss with you, does number one stand clarified?

Participant: Would you please repeat it?

Mr. Gibbs: The statement is, and I'll state the clarification -- we're not going to rewrite it to that extent: "As of now, no Office of Education funding should be made in the specific geographic area of residence of the 'Community Experts' here represented without their prior consultation." In Woodlawn -- now, be cool -- in Woodlawn, TWO has been there for nine years. There's nobody else represents the community in Woodlawn. I'm here as a representative from Woodlawn. Now that doesn't mean that the next time there's a meeting here that Chambers is going to be here, or Gibbs is going to be here, or somebody else is going to be here; but somebody from my organization is going to be here if you're talking about doing something in Woodlawn. Or someone from Nebraska if you're talking about doing something in Nebraska, in Chambers' area; or a Navajo if you're talking about doing something on the reservation with the Navajos. Does that clarify?

Participant: The reference 'their' is what bothers me in number one.

Mr. Gibbs: Okay, we can move on to number two.

Participant: No. Could you put "those communities' prior consultation" instead of "their"? Or the organization? I don't agree that an organization is necessarily always stands for a community . . . .

Miss Easterling: [to Mr. Gibbs] Gibbs, do you want this to read so that this group has control over who participates. . . .

Mr. Gibbs: [to Miss Easterling] I want to leave now, and let them [the conference] discuss this; why don't we [the community people] stand and go, because I don't want to go through all of these resolutions like this.

Miss Easterling: [to Gibbs] I don't either. I think we should walk out and tell them to discuss it and we'll be back in forty-five minutes. That's what we should do, if you agree. [Discussion among the community panel]

Mr. Gibbs: We feel at this point, because this meeting is deteriorating to such a point we're going to let you discuss this whole thing, and you vote it up or down.
[At this point, the community representatives temporarily left the meeting.]
Mr. Olson: The community people have spoken among themselves, and they decided it would be more appropriate simply to let the group in here discuss what its reaction wishes to be. I take it that I should conduct the discussion, and we should have a vote either in favor of or opposed to these positions. You shouldn't feel some overwhelming guilt

about rejecting what the community people have proposed. I don't wish to urge you to reject them; but I think to identify rejecting these resolutions with rejecting the community people, or to feel that the community people are going to interpret our rejecting the bloc of resolutions as rejecting their total position, is simply wrong.

Mr. Chambers, Mr. Gibbs, the leaders from the communities who are here have worked with academic people for a very long time. They know, as I said at the beginning of the discussion, that what we *do* is a great deal more important than what we *say*. And I would suggest that you not be sentimental about saying what you believe. On the other hand, if the position of the community people is close enough to something that you can buy so that you can vote for the whole thing, vote for it.

Participant: Since the community people left, do we have new rules or are you going to follow the same rules?

Mr. Olson: I would suggest that we follow the same rules: that we discuss this for forty-five minutes, and that we then vote.

* * *

In the ensuing discussion, it was decided that no vote be taken as such, but rather that the general consensus of the conference concerning each resolution individually be determined and so communicated to the community group.

C. LETTER TO DON DAVIES

Much of the remainder of the discussion concerned procedural matters; eventually the group talked about the resolutions one at a time. The sense of the discussion was summarized by Mr. Olson as follows in a letter forwarded to Mr. Davies.

Dear Don Davies:

I am writing to you to communicate to you the resolutions of the group of community representatives who attended the Minneapolis conference of the project. It should be observed that the group responses of the people from Higher Education and the schools represent materials from a sort of Quaker meeting discussion to obtain consensus rather than resolutions or amendments made in formal parliamentary session. Each proposal as discussed (with the exception of one) was approved by a majority of people from Higher Education and the schools, generally by a large majority. The tapes of the session are available for the Office's perusal. At the end of the discussion period, it was observed that the people from Higher Education and the schools were in accord with the spirit of all of the proposals from the community group save proposal 10 which was deemed inappropriate on the grounds of its possible limitation of academic freedom. Mr. Gibbs, who is the chairman of the group of the community representatives, is discussing that point with his group at his own initiative (cf. enclosure). The majority was large in all cases save for Resolution III where the split was about 2/3rds for and 1/3rd against.

The consensus with respect to implementation and/or modification of the community position by the people from Higher Education and the schools is as follows:

Resolution I: As of now, no Office of Education funding should be made in the specific geographic area of residence of the "Community Experts" here represented without their prior consultation.
Discussion by People in Higher Education and the Schools: The discussion suggested that the Minneapolis Conference community group should be expanded to include persons and communities similar to those involved in Minneapolis, i.e. persons from various sections of the nation who could represent their communities as ably as the group at Minneapolis did (Messrs. Gibbs and Chambers, representing the Community group, had agreed to this point in previous discussion). What is probably needed are regional and local community groups similar to the Minneapolis group to advise the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development along the lines suggested and under some kind of national auspices.

Resolution II: The "Community Experts" here present should be brought together by the Office of Education to help develop on a national level groups similar to themselves.
Discussion: The resolution was taken to describe consultation with the Minneapolis community group with respect to the formation of regional or local groups of community representatives which would include the members of this group and others. The group from Higher Education did not wish to have the Minneapolis "community representatives" placed in a hierarchical position with respect to the regional groups formed but rather in an equal position.

Resolution III: As of now and in the future, no Office of Education funds should be given to universities to study the poor, the alienated, or the powerless of this country. Funds rather should be directed towards the problems of racism and ethnocentrism in education. This must be done in consultation with the people mentioned in No. 2 above.
Discussion: The people from Higher Education wished to exclude such categories as the physically or mentally handicapped from the groups of the "powerless." Resolution III is understood by the groups from Higher Education as (1) describing a set of priorities in which action with communities is given first priority; (2) indicating that study without action is meaningless; (3) indicating that study in alienated communities by Higher Education must be "study with" people not "study of" them. The group fully supported the need for intensive study of racism and ethnocentrism in America.

Resolution IV: No Office of Education funds shall be released to public or private schools for the "retraining" of teachers until Nos. 1 and 2 above are accomplished.
Discussion: Resolution IV was taken by the people from Higher Education and the schools as describing a priority and was generally accepted.

Resolution V: All federal education programs dealing with minority groups in America should be subject to the approval of the Office of Education and the community involved; such as, Navajo education programs should be approved by the Navajo Board of Directors and the school boards in the local communities.
Discussion: Resolution V was accepted. Its relation to Bureau of Indian Affairs prerogatives was not clarified.

Resolution VI: An incentive bonus to teachers, funded through the Office of Education, should be paid those teachers who work in economically depressed areas, provided that the community, as described in Nos. 1 and 2 above, has the right of hiring and firing.
Discussion: The resolution was accepted as implying that the community should have a meaningful, voting involvement in the hiring and firing of teachers.

Resolution VII: We call on the School or College of Education of each sponsoring institution in the Tri-University Conference to actively support these resolutions. We further request from the staff of the Conference reports as to progress on them from time to time.
Discussion: Resolution VII was accepted, given the discussion of Resolutions I-VI.

Resolution VIII: Future Tri-University conferences should not be organized without planning that includes representatives of the "Community Experts" here assembled.
Discussion: The chairman indicated that he would consult with the "Community Representatives" as to their interest in the topics of subsequent conferences and their sense of the extent to which the topics were or were not relevant to their interests. If community representatives feel the conference is within their area of interest, they will be invited. Also, additional community representatives may be invited to later conferences as topics and occasions suggest; for instance, if Bi-Lingual Education were the topic, additional representatives of the Spanish surname community might be invited. (Future planning after New Orleans will include a consultation with the community group; the New Orleans was already largely planned during last summer and before the Minneapolis conference).

Resolution IX: At the next Conference, the "Community Experts" listed below should be brought back for the purpose of giving an assessment of the impact of these resolutions and this meeting on our individual communities, and on the sponsoring institutions of the Conference.
Discussion: The chairman pointed out that he has already agreed to bring the community representatives together another time for consultation and assessment. He would take assessment to mean some sort of evaluation of the extent to which the members of the conference had moved in the direction of the commitments it was undertaking in accepting the resolutions, that evaluation to be specific and not merely impressionistic.

To the objection that the Project is already committed to certain goals contained in its proposals to the Office of Education, the chairman suggested that the community representatives should be asked to make their assessment in terms of the difference between what the Project set out to do and what it does ultimately accomplish. Someone from the floor pointed out that the fact that people such as the community representatives who were present are going to assess the impact of the Project on their communities whether they are asked to or not and that the Project participants should be interested in finding out what their assessment is. Wide agreement with this view was expressed.

Resolution X: It is insulting to us as "Community Experts" to participate in a conference and be submitted to the colonial and paternalistic attitudes

and responses of speakers such as Dean Griffiths of New York University. We recommend that this attitude be condemned by the assembly and avoided at future meetings of the Tri-University Conference.
Discussion: This resolution was rejected in favor of a statement that the conference participants reaffirm their belief in intellectual freedom and their intent to encourage and respect as wide a representation of problems and opinions as is possible. Mr. Gibbs is discussing this point with his group. This statement was followed by several comments on how close the conference participants were to the position of the resolutions in general with the exception of number 10.

Resolution XI: These resolutions, whether or not approved by the Conference, should be made part of the official records which are normally submitted to the Office of Education.
Discussion: This resolution was accepted as an item not open for discussion since the chairman had already agreed to enter the resolutions in the transcript of the conference.

It is clear that the position of the people from Higher Education and the schools was different from, but not greatly different from, that of the community people on most of the issues defined by the community representatives.

Some misunderstanding has developed with respect to the community representative's leaving of the meeting after having presented their resolutions for discussion. Mr. Gibbs tape-recorded in Minneapolis a comment concerning the group's interest in leaving the meeting, his statement is as follows:

> The conference had closed upon the community representatives' return. I wish to indicate that we did not leave the conference. There should be a clarification. We "walked out" to give the representatives (of Higher Education and the schools) here an opportunity to discuss in honesty without feeling pressure or fearing the fact that the individuals who represent the community would be in any way hostile towards them because of the community group's positions or attitudes relative to the Office of Education's program. We had decided (when we recessed) that we would return to hear what the final decision was in relationship to our particular resolutions. My statement here is a clarification. There is no basis for saying we had "walked out" and were not interested in any way in participating in the conference, or were condemning the last two days of this conference and our participation in it.

Gibbs' statement represents, as I see it, his respect for people's right to discussion and to come to the formulation of independent positions; he also said the same thing before his group recessed, in a remark which is on our recording of the meeting a statement which I failed to hear.

D. RESULTS OF THE RESOLUTIONS

Since the Minneapolis Conference, the Office of Education has heard testimony in favor of the "Minneapolis position" from Mr. Gibbs and Mr. Norris. What the fruits of the conference will be will not be evident until the new Office of Education guidelines are published; its advisory committees set up; and Higher Education and the schools of America begin to propose new programs.